



# Race to the Top

## Technical Review Form - Tier 2

### New York Application #4800NY-1



#### A. State Success Factors

	Available	Tier 1	Tier 2	Init
<b>(A)(1) Articulating State's education reform agenda and LEA's participation in it</b>	<b>65</b>	<b>57</b>	<b>57</b>	
(i) Articulating comprehensive, coherent reform agenda	5	5	5	
(ii) Securing LEA commitment	45	40	40	
(iii) Translating LEA participation into statewide impact	15	12	12	

#### (A)(1) Reviewer Comments: (Tier 1)

Applicant's 2005 P-16 Education: A Plan for Action articulates a comprehensive, coherent, reform agenda. Elements of this plan provide a solid foundation for RTT expectations. Applicant has boldly accelerated its incremental gains targets for student achievement outcomes if RTT funding becomes available. For example, the NAEP target for grade 8 math for African American students is 15% in 2013; the RTT target is 23%. Applicant has secured MOUs for comprehensive participation in state's reform plan from 66% of LEAs representing 550 school systems and 40% of the schools. More importantly, the 66% of the LEAs represent 82% of the students and 92% of the students in poverty. However, only 61% of teacher unions signed MOUs of support which could be an implementation obstacle. Applicant's ability to translate this participation into statewide impact is enhanced by two things. In 2002 New York City enacted a Mayoral Control Statute giving the mayor control of 1.1 million city school students which represent 33% of state's students. Since 1948 the state has effectively established a network of 37 Boards of Cooperative Educational Services (BOCES) that provide direct support to school systems throughout the state.

<b>(A)(2) Building strong statewide capacity to implement, scale up, and sustain proposed plans</b>	<b>30</b>	<b>25</b>	<b>27</b>	
(i) Ensuring the capacity to implement	20	18	18	
(ii) Using broad stakeholder support	10	7	9	

#### (A)(2) Reviewer Comments: (Tier 1)

Applicant's plan is to strategically move to a more service-oriented relationship rather than a compliance-oriented relationship with LEAs. Through the strategic use of RTT funds the Applicant will expand state support structures and procedures to better align and provide support to LEAs in the implementation of the portfolio of projects outlined in the proposal. This new model will build upon and enhance the capacity of delivery through an established regional network strategy that leverages BOCES and Higher Learning networks. Applicant's key leaders, Chancellor Tisch, State Commissioner of Education Steiner, and Deputy Commissioner King are recognized for their strong and experienced leadership in their respective areas of expertise. Applicant will restructure and align resources to support RTT initiative. Examples of realigned resources will include: \$70-85 million from a 2004 class action settlement, \$13 million from ARRA Title I School Improvement funds, and \$240 million from Title I funds to support 5% lowest-achieving Title I schools. Applicant did not provide letters of stakeholder support in appendix.

#### (A)(2) Reviewer Comments: (Tier 2)



Due to technical problems by the Department of Education we originally were not provided letters of support.

<b>(A)(3) Demonstrating significant progress in raising achievement and closing gaps</b>	<b>30</b>	<b>28</b>	<b>28</b>
(i) Making progress in each reform area	5	5	5
(ii) Improving student outcomes	25	23	23

**(A)(3) Reviewer Comments: (Tier 1)**

Applicant's Regent's P-16 Education Plan, with goals similar to those in RTT, demonstrates steady student achievement gains and the narrowing of achievement gaps using a nationally recognized student assessment system. Examples are included in the following. The Applicant has been recognized with an A rating in Ed Weekly Quality Counts Review for its efforts in terms of standards, assessments, and accountability which are considered to be among the most rigorous in the nation. Recently, as a result of recommendations from the Center for Educational Leadership and Technology (CELT), the applicant upgraded its data delivery system. The Applicant's policies for nontraditional students have provided a significant number of teachers so that most of the math and science vacancies have been eliminated. The Applicant's School Under Registration Review program has received national recognition. As a result of these examples, overall student achievement on NAEP tests is rising and there is evidence of the narrowing the achievement gap. Also, the Applicant's graduation rate has noticeably increased from 2004 to 2008. Specifically, in New York City the minority graduation rate of the same period has increased from 44% to 56%.

<b>Total</b>	<b>125</b>	<b>110</b>	<b>112</b>
--------------	------------	------------	------------

**B. Standards and Assessments**

	<b>Available</b>	<b>Tier 1</b>	<b>Tier 2</b>	<b>Init</b>
<b>(B)(1) Developing and adopting common standards</b>	<b>40</b>	<b>40</b>	<b>40</b>	
(i) Participating in consortium developing high-quality standards	20	20	20	
(ii) Adopting standards	20	20	20	

**(B)(1) Reviewer Comments: (Tier 1)**

Applicant has signed a MOA to participate in Common Core Standards Consortium Initiative (48 states) and has developed a plan for adoption of Common Core Standards within the allotted time frame.

<b>(B)(2) Developing and implementing common, high-quality assessments</b>	<b>10</b>	<b>9</b>	<b>9</b>
--	-----------	----------	----------

**(B)(2) Reviewer Comments: (Tier 1)**

Applicant has signed MOU/Agreements for the Common Assessment Consortium (37 states), and the Summative Multi-State Consortium (SMARTER)/(13 states) to develop balanced assessments for the common core standards.

<b>(B)(3) Supporting the transition to enhanced standards and high-quality assessments</b>	<b>20</b>	<b>18</b>	<b>18</b>
--	-----------	-----------	-----------

**(B)(3) Reviewer Comments: (Tier 1)**

Applicant's previously noted recognition in the Quality Counts rating provides significant baseline capacity to support this transition. Applicant's Regent Examination Program is nationally recognized for both its quality

and rigor. The framework for this program also provides excellent support for transition to extended standards and high-quality assessments.

Total	70	67	67
-------	----	----	----

### C. Data Systems to Support Instruction

	Available	Tier 1	Tier 2	Init
(C)(1) Fully implementing a statewide longitudinal data system	24	10	10	

#### (C)(1) Reviewer Comments: (Tier 1)

Applicant has implemented 5 of 12 America Competes Act elements.

(C)(2) Accessing and using State data	5	4	4	
---------------------------------------	---	---	---	--

#### (C)(2) Reviewer Comments: (Tier 1)

Applicant has an outlined plan with seven goals that describes activities that will result in completely implementing a "next generation" comprehensive instructional reporting system over the next three years. Applicant currently has in place a P-12 State data audit system and collects annual test records of individual students. Applicant's implementation of its comprehensive instructional reporting system will result in providing complete and timely information to state and local decision makers and will even include data links of student outcomes to teacher preparation programs.

(C)(3) Using data to improve instruction	18	15	15	
--	----	----	----	--

#### (C)(3) Reviewer Comments: (Tier 1)

Applicant's RTT strategy outlines three key activities to successfully implement best-in-class data system which includes: a comprehensive reporting system, an integrated professional development network, and availability of data available to researchers. Applicant's capacity to implement this impressive data system is enhanced by the model already being used in New York City schools.

Total	47	29	29	
-------	----	----	----	--

### D. Great Teachers and Leaders

	Available	Tier 1	Tier 2	Init
(D)(1) Providing high-quality pathways for aspiring teachers and principals	21	20	20	

#### (D)(1) Reviewer Comments: (Tier 1)

Applicant has legal authority (2000) to approve alternative pathways to certification. Recently this authority has now included non-IHEs providers. Applicant meets four elements in the definition requirements for alternative pathways. Applicant's multiple alternative pathways have provided an effective means to provide teachers, as identified by a data-driven teacher and principal supply and demand model, in areas of critical needs as evidenced by 2200 teaching certificates issued last year. Applicant's Teaching Fellows Program, particularly, has provided great support as evidenced in the placement of 1983 math teachers since 2002.

(D)(2) Improving teacher and principal effectiveness based on performance	58	51	51	
(i) Measuring student growth	5	4	4	



(ii) Developing evaluation systems	15	13	13
(iii) Conducting annual evaluations	10	9	9
(iv) Using evaluations to inform key decisions	28	25	25

**(D)(2) Reviewer Comments: (Tier 1)**

Applicant has developed a teacher and principal effectiveness evaluation reform plan which will extend the State's current plan and include new and more rigorous professional standards. Applicant clearly outlines goals, strategies, and supporting activities for ensuring an effective redesign of both teacher and principal evaluation programs. Applicant's plan will include: a continuation of annual evaluations, multitiered evaluation criteria, data support system through NY-SIRIS that creates access to student achievement and growth measures, and the use of these measures to be 30%-40% of evaluation criteria. Applicant's new evaluation system will provide key performance-based evaluation criteria that can be used in the creation of enhanced career ladder options and compensation opportunities. Applicant does not address strategies for removal of ineffective teachers. Applicant will need to be successful in securing collective bargaining agreements that support the new performance evaluation systems.

<b>(D)(3) Ensuring equitable distribution of effective teachers and principals</b>	<b>25</b>	<b>20</b>	<b>20</b>
(i) Ensuring equitable distribution in high-poverty or high-minority schools	15	12	12
(ii) Ensuring equitable distribution in hard-to-staff subjects and specialty areas	10	8	8

**(D)(3) Reviewer Comments: (Tier 1)**

Applicant in 2003 effectively abolished emergency certification in high-need schools. Applicant will adopt a strategy to "dramatically improve" equitable distribution of effective teachers/principals by "incentivizing" LEAs and their collective bargaining units. Applicant's incentivizing strategy has the potential to dramatically improve equitable distribution of professionals in targeted schools and for STEM programs. In addition, Applicant has expanded the quality of its present Teacher Induction Program.

<b>(D)(4) Improving the effectiveness of teacher and principal preparation programs</b>	<b>14</b>	<b>12</b>	<b>12</b>
---	-----------	-----------	-----------

**(D)(4) Reviewer Comments: (Tier 1)**

Applicant's new performance-based evaluation system will link student achievement and student growth data to teachers and principals which in turn will be linked to in-State credentialing programs. Applicant's new data base of professional performance measures will provide critical value-added information to guide and improve professional preparation programs. More details would be helpful to provide examples of how data collected will be used.

<b>(D)(5) Providing effective support to teachers and principals</b>	<b>20</b>	<b>18</b>	<b>18</b>
--	-----------	-----------	-----------

**(D)(5) Reviewer Comments: (Tier 1)**

Applicant outlines a comprehensive differentiated professional development program. Significant components of this program will be the creation of a New Teacher Induction Program, focus on high-need schools, increased use of student achievement and student growth data to inform best practice which will be shared through expanded networking of service providers.

<b>Total</b>	<b>138</b>	<b>121</b>	<b>121</b>
--------------	------------	------------	------------



**E. Turning Around the Lowest-Achieving Schools**

	Available	Tier 1	Tier 2	Init
<b>(E)(1) Intervening in the lowest-achieving schools and LEAs</b>	10	10	10	

**(E)(1) Reviewer Comments: (Tier 1)**

Applicant has the legal authority to register low-performing LEAs and schools and enter them into its School Under Registration Review (SURR) Program which provides a series of intervention options that focus on improving student achievement. Applicant acknowledges that the present SURR program intervention strategies have not resulted in significant increases in student achievement and recognizes the need to strengthen LEA/school connections. Applicant welcomes the restructuring of its current program based upon lessons learned and embraces the opportunity RTT provides to strengthen efforts to intervene in low-performing schools.

<b>(E)(2) Turning around the lowest-achieving schools</b>	40	34	34	
(i) Identifying the persistently lowest-achieving schools	5	4	4	
(ii) Turning around the persistently lowest-achieving schools	35	30	30	

**(E)(2) Reviewer Comments: (Tier 1)**

Applicant has an effective mechanism for identification of low-performing schools. The new plan, which will support four school intervention models, will include an expanded comprehensive system of support to LEAs which will include External Technical Assistance Center. Applicant will reorganize support structures and systems such as creating an Office of Innovative Schools Models that will expand efforts for innovative partners in the marketplace in an effort to expand student program options. Examples of options include: recognized successful charter school programs, Mass Insight Partnership Zone and the development of Virtual and Blended Schools.

<b>Total</b>	50	44	44	
--------------	----	----	----	--

**F. General**

	Available	Tier 1	Tier 2	Init
<b>(F)(1) Making education funding a priority</b>	10	10	10	

**(F)(1) Reviewer Comments: (Tier 1)**

Applicant has adopted a new approach to funding education in 2008 which creates an equity funding formula which reallocates State Foundation Aid funds to support 204 districts that have schools that serve the highest concentrations of students in need. Applicant's funding for public education from FY 2008 to FY 2009 increased a significant 2.3%.

<b>(F)(2) Ensuring successful conditions for high-performing charter schools and other innovative schools</b>	40	36	32	
---	----	----	----	--

**(F)(2) Reviewer Comments: (Tier 1)**

Applicant has 140+ charter schools among its 4540 public schools. The Applicant is considered, by definition, to have a medium cap on the number of charter schools. Applicant has established a positive charter school environment. Applicant has been recognized in recent report by the National Alliance for Public Charter Schools as second in the nation for its quality control policies. Applicant's charter schools receive equitable funding as compared to traditional schools and charter schools have numerous options for



funding support in acquisition of facilities. Applicant has the authority to enable LEAs to operate innovative, autonomous public schools other than charter schools. Tech Valley Regional Technology Institute a leading example of this approach.

**(F)(2) Reviewer Comments: (Tier 2)**

During the interview, while there was an interest in increasing the present cap, it was clarified that there is a current charter school cap of 200 which by definition puts the applicant in low cap category.

<b>(F)(3) Demonstrating other significant reform conditions</b>	5	4	4
---	---	---	---

**(F)(3) Reviewer Comments: (Tier 1)**

Applicant has a nationally recognized interconnected network of educational services which provides universal access to libraries, museums, archives and other cultural institutions.

<b>Total</b>	55	50	46
--------------	----	----	----

**Competitive Preference Priority 2: Emphasis on STEM**

	Available	Tier 1	Tier 2	Init
<b>Competitive Preference Priority 2: Emphasis on STEM</b>	15	15	15	

**Competitive Reviewer Comments: (Tier 1)**

Applicant has outlined a commitment for a broad engagement strategy to support STEM that is embedded into the four assurance sections. An impressive group of stakeholders across the state has been involved and are committed to Applicant's STEM initiative. While the Applicant as a whole has met the Competitive Priority, the Applicant could expand upon strategies to address under-represented groups such as minorities and women for greater inclusion in STEM programs.

<b>Total</b>	15	15	15	
--------------	----	----	----	--

**Absolute Priority - Comprehensive Approach to Education Reform**

	Available	Tier 1	Tier 2	Init
<b>Absolute Priority - Comprehensive Approach to Education Reform</b>		Yes	Yes	

**Absolute Reviewer Comments: (Tier 1)**

Applicant clearly and strategically embraces all RTT components and comprehensively addresses all four educational reform areas. Noteworthy, is the fact that applicant's current Reform Plan is complementary to RTT reform agenda.

<b>Total</b>		0	0	
--------------	--	---	---	--

<b>Grand Total</b>	500	436	434	
--------------------	-----	-----	-----	--





# Race to the Top

## Technical Review Form - Tier 2

### New York Application #4800ny-3



#### A. State Success Factors

	Available	Tier 1	Tier 2	Init
<b>(A)(1) Articulating State's education reform agenda and LEA's participation in it</b>	<b>65</b>	<b>49</b>	<b>46</b>	
(i) Articulating comprehensive, coherent reform agenda	5	5	4	
(ii) Securing LEA commitment	45	33	33	
(iii) Translating LEA participation into statewide impact	15	11	9	

#### (A)(1) Reviewer Comments: (Tier 1)

NY presents a comprehensive plan that delineates extremely ambitious goals, a foundation for reform put in place prior to the R2T initiative, and a clear focal point – the instructional moment between a teacher and a student. The plan links proposed actions and strategies in each of the four ARRA education reform priorities back to this focal point. The plan is based in large part on the experiences and education reform vision of the State's top educators as well as on the lessons learned from successful local initiatives. Moreover, it is in many ways an extension of the State's own PK-16 Education: A Plan for Action which led to solid gains in student achievement since its adoption in 2005. In the case of NY, R2T really does seem to represent a chance to reinforce and speed work already being done. NY sees the development and adoption of new standards and assessments as an opportunity to go from good to great. It sees the establishment of an advanced longitudinal data system as an opportunity to give educators the information they need to excel. It sees the R2T priorities around supporting educators as a chance to attract, develop, and ensure effectiveness for all students and the turnaround schools initiative as a chance to provide under-served students with the opportunity they deserve. The plan is thorough and cogent. For these reasons it receives high points. In theory the high-level plan presented here is a good one that looks to borrow from best practices and innovation wherever it can be found and to build on the successes and experience that the State and its LEAs have created at home. The terms and conditions of NY's MOU and accompanying SOW reflect a strong commitment from signers to the State's reform plans. The MOU is clear in its expectations and it delineates consequences for an LEA's failure to implement the State's plan in a timely manner. There is, however, a provision that nothing in the MOU that contradicts language in a collective bargaining agreement shall be binding. While the MOU does stipulate that LEAs and their unions will agree to bargain in good faith around elements of the state reform plan that are superseded by collective bargaining language, the fact that in the end the collective bargaining agreements can undermine significant portions of the State's reform plan is a problem. Despite this fact NY was only able to obtain 61% of the applicable districts' union leaders. NY's application shows substantial commitment from its LEAs and the 550 participating LEAs represent 82% of all students in NY and 94% of students in poverty. NY's projected gains in student achievement and in closing achievement gaps between all students and at-risk subgroups are impressive when comparing projected gains with R2T funding and projected gains without. In these comparisons the projected NAEP gains are anywhere from double to five times as much as they are projected to be without R2T funding. (The projected differences are smaller but still substantial in the State assessments due to the anticipation of more challenging assessments being established.) Likewise graduation rates are anticipated to be three times greater with R2T funding than they would be without and enrollment rates are projected to increase at more than double the rate expected without funding. If there is a concern with the impact of R2T funds projected by NY it is that the baseline gains projected without R2T



funding could be considered too modest. Also, whether only a 4.5% total increase in the graduation rate is truly ambitious could be questioned. Finally the union engagement/investment point outlined throughout the application has the potential to impact translation to statewide impact. NY gets high points for presenting a cogent plan that involves most of the students in the State but misses full credit for these reasons.

**(A)(1) Reviewer Comments: (Tier 2)**

A key element of articulating a coherent reform agenda and ensuring statewide impact is describing how the State will ensure statewide implementation at the LEA level. When asked to expand on how the State would ensure wide-scale adoption of best practices as they are established, the response did not provide enough explanation of how NYDOE would make this happen.

<b>(A)(2) Building strong statewide capacity to implement, scale up, and sustain proposed plans</b>	<b>30</b>	<b>19</b>	<b>21</b>	
(i) Ensuring the capacity to implement	20	14	14	
(ii) Using broad stakeholder support	10	5	7	

**(A)(2) Reviewer Comments: (Tier 1)**

Under the new leadership of three proven, innovative reformers, NYSED has proposed a total reorganization to facilitate a shift from a compliance-driven organization to a service-driven one. The new organizational structure was developed specifically to support the implementation of the State's R2T plan by the participating LEAs. There are a number of new, dedicated offices, including an R2T Management Office, charged with researching, documenting and disseminating best practices; holding LEAs accountable; and providing them with the technical support to meet their local and State-level R2T goals. NY has a thorough system for assuring efficient grant administration, funds disbursement and fiscal accountability that is created through a coordinated effort between NYSED's R2T management office, the state comptroller's office, the state COO, attorney general's office and an NYSED Administrative Support Group. The budget narrative is comprehensive and describes adequately how grant funds would be used to accomplish the State's goals and targets and to implement their proposed plans. However, there are projected expenses (e.g. \$550 for executive chairs) that call into question NY's judgment on responsible stewardship of funds. NY's application does a good job of indicating how other current sources of funding can be accessed to augment R2T funding. In addition it points to a state Initiative that calls for increases in future funding as the State demands more accountability from LEAs. However, the application is not specific about ways in which reforms started under and established with R2T funds will continue to be funded in the future. This is a concern, especially when reviewing the vast difference in projected student achievement gains with and without the R2T funds. NY held a number of engagement meetings to discuss R2T plans and proposals with multiple stakeholder groups. The meetings were well attended and there was impressive stakeholder representation at the meetings. There were, however, no union leaders in attendance (though the application does say imply they were invited) and the sub appendix listing the 98 letters of support the State received was missing from the application.

**(A)(2) Reviewer Comments: (Tier 2)**

Due to an U.S. Department of Education administrative oversight, NY's letters of support were not included in the original peer reviewer materials. This was corrected for Tier 2 and this explains the increase in points.

<b>(A)(3) Demonstrating significant progress in raising achievement and closing gaps</b>	<b>30</b>	<b>23</b>	<b>23</b>	
(i) Making progress in each reform area	5	5	5	
(ii) Improving student outcomes	25	18	18	

**(A)(3) Reviewer Comments: (Tier 1)**



NY's agenda around standards and assessments has been in place for over a decade, and prior to their current work in state consortia to develop widely held common core standards, they had already produced a strong set of standards with accompanying assessments. They have used these standards and assessments to ensure there is a common, high graduation standard in the state and they have periodically reviewed and revised these tools to ensure they are current. This is a strength area for NY. In the area of data tracking, NY State has steadily worked to improve its statewide data tracking system and build on the successful systems developed in New York City. NYSED has partnered with several outside experts to devise plans for updating its data tracking system and the plans outlined in the application scaffold on to these past efforts and improvements. While as a state, NY's efforts around promoting educator effectiveness have not been comprehensive in the ways proposed in the application, they have developed substantial innovations in the areas of teacher preparation, ongoing support and principal preparation. This prior success and experience with innovation strengthens their application. In the area of school turnaround, NY has been lauded for its accountability system and its ability to effectively identify failing and – if necessary – close or transform failing schools. In addition, a number of LEAs in the state have effectively partnered with education management organizations and other external entities to create and support new schools or school models to take the place of those failing schools. NY will have a rich set of its own best practices in this area on which to base new reform. NY provides evidence of other federal and state funding they have or are seeking to pursue for the aforementioned reforms. NY has shown impressive gains in state assessment scores since 2003. However the gains in NAEP scores are more modest – and in the case of 8th grade math and reading almost nonexistent. NY State is however one of the most successful states when it comes to closing achievement gaps. NY narrowed proportionately more of its gaps than did other states. NY State's graduation rate has increased 5% for all students since 2003. The rate for students in all but one major subgroup has surpassed this providing evidence of NY's success in closing the achievement gap. NY's application did not do an adequate job of explaining connections between the data and the actions that contributed to it.

Total	125	91	90	
-------	-----	----	----	--

## B. Standards and Assessments

	Available	Tier 1	Tier 2	Init
<b>(B)(1) Developing and adopting common standards</b>	40	40	40	
(i) Participating in consortium developing high-quality standards	20	20	20	
(ii) Adopting standards	20	20	20	

### (B)(1) Reviewer Comments: (Tier 1)

NY is a member of the Common Core States Standards Initiative along with 48 states, DC and two territories. This Initiative has published draft standards in both K-8 Math and ELA as well as College- and Career Readiness standards in Math and ELA. NY includes a statement that they are committed to adopting these standards upon their release in or around spring 2010. The Initiative has documented that these standards will be internationally bench-marked and ensure students are college- and career-ready. NY State adopted statewide standards in 1996 and seems to have a commitment to ongoing, quality implementation. Evidence for this includes: (1) NY regularly reviews and revises their statewide standards in order to benchmark them to international standards. (2) In 2007 ELA and ESL standards were revised and NY began reviewing its Career and Technical Education and Career Development standards. (3) NYSED created a NY State Academy for Teaching and Learning with a stated purpose to support educators in the use of the statewide standards. Furthermore the NY State Board of Regents has approved a process for review and adoption of the Common Core Standards by the end of July 2010. This process and timeframe appears thorough and realistic providing time for public comment, submission of feedback to the CCSSO/NGA, and adoption prior to August 2010.



(B)(2) Developing and implementing common, high-quality assessments	10	10	10
---	----	----	----

**(B)(2) Reviewer Comments: (Tier 1)**

NY appears committed to working jointly with a significant number of other states to develop common, high-quality assessments aligned with the aforementioned consortium's common K-12 standards. NY is currently working in partnership with three separate consortia (containing 37, 13 and 23 states respectively) which are seeking separate R2T assessment funding to develop assessment systems based on the Common Core standards. Each of these consortia prioritizes multiple stakeholder group involvement in the development of the assessments as well as the utilization of international benchmarks to ensure the assessments truly measure a student's college- and career-readiness. Moreover, NY lays out a clear and realistic two-year timeline for development of the assessments and the technology to support them with a target of SY 2012-13 for the pilot of the new assessment system. NY's application does a good job of connecting its own current work on assessments linked to state standards to the joint effort to produce new, effective, common assessments linked to Common Core standards.

(B)(3) Supporting the transition to enhanced standards and high-quality assessments	20	15	15
---	----	----	----

**(B)(3) Reviewer Comments: (Tier 1)**

NY State's plan to support the transition to enhanced standards and high-quality assessments is sound. It lays out four overarching goals, rationales for those goals, and a general level of detail around specific activities that the State will undertake to achieve those goals. The plan does lack a level of detail needed for full points. For example, when the application refers to the regionally-based professional development networks that will be integral to building the LEA capacity necessary to adopt the new standards, curriculum frameworks and assessments effectively, it makes general statements like, "the RTTT Management Office will coordinate the implementation of regionally-based professional development activities based on the new aligned standards, curriculum frameworks, and assessments, across the four assurance areas using a regional network strategy." This gives a sense of how this incredibly important piece of the overall transition plan will look, but leaves many questions. Some of these are dealt with in the timeline portion of the response but overall the plan still needs substantial development before it will be clear how professional development around standards and assessments will look. This same criticism of being overly general can be applied to other parts of the response as well. The response says the Board of Regents will engage stakeholders and that engagement is critical in building the momentum needed to effectively promote the adoption of new standards, but it does not say much directly about what this engagement will entail or look like. Given NY's previous, recent experiences with adopting new standards, there should be a clearer picture presented in this response.

Total	70	65	65
-------	----	----	----

**C. Data Systems to Support Instruction**

	Available	Tier 1	Tier 2	Init
(C)(1) Fully Implementing a statewide longitudinal data system	24	10	10	

**(C)(1) Reviewer Comments: (Tier 1)**

Where the summary chart indicated that "yes" NY did have an element specified by the America Competes Act, 2 points were awarded. Where the chart indicated "no", 0 points were awarded and where it indicated "partial", 0 point was awarded.

(C)(2) Accessing and using State data	5	4	4
---------------------------------------	---	---	---



**(C)(2) Reviewer Comments: (Tier 1)**

NY presents a comprehensive plan for ensuring that data from the statewide longitudinal data system are both accessible to all stakeholders and useful to continuous improvement efforts. The plan contains clear goals, timelines, responsible parties and general strategies. Even more important it contains references to best practices and similar efforts in other states as well as in New York City. This detail makes this a solid response. More detail about strategies for achieving more difficult parts of the plan (such as how to get the necessary consensus on and investment in a growth model) was needed for full credit.

**(C)(3) Using data to improve instruction**

18

16

16

**(C)(3) Reviewer Comments: (Tier 1)**

The overall vision that NY has around using data to improve instruction is strong. It affirms that NY will ultimately have Statewide Instructional Reporting and Improvement System that will link students and teacher course-level performance over time; allow anyone to analyze real-time data to identify problems and progress for discrete individuals, classes, demographic groups or schools; facilitate the ongoing reflection on and revision of instruction based on data for groups of teachers; and provide early warning data points for at-risk students. There is good reason to believe this is possible because NYSED will base much of these efforts on the works and best practices of NYCDOE which had already developed a sophisticated data collection and reporting system that includes the elements outlined above. The plan proposes using that as the starting point and trying to improve or enhance it using systems and best practices from other NY districts and from across the country. NYC's system has links to resources for educators, collaborative space for educators and a parent portal. NYSED has secured NYCDOE's commitment to help scale-up the system and pilot it in other districts. NY State's application also relies heavily on work previously piloted and adopted in NYCDOE on professionally developing educators on the use of data to improve instruction. NYC's Collaborative Inquiry Network structure has the necessary components to effectively build the capacity to use data on a weekly basis to improve instruction. The application talks about utilizing existing state-level support structures to disseminate the NYC model for using data to identify issues and improve instruction. While this seems like a logical strategy there is some question whether the individuals in those pre-existing structures are the correct people to disseminate the NYC approach. What's more the application does not talk about the challenge of identifying the requisite number of people at the district level to staff the collaborative network structure. The capacity and effectiveness of the people who fill these positions are the key to the overall strategy's success and thinking about how to find them and get them in those positions is critical. Some of that thinking should be reflected in the application. The application's timelines are realistic. NYSED's intent to also develop an early warning system within the data tracking system will further support LEAs in their efforts to use data on an ongoing basis to target instruction. NY has a straightforward plan to share data from its instructional improvement system – in the aggregate and disaggregated to different sub-groups of students – with researchers.

Total

47

30

30

**D. Great Teachers and Leaders****(D)(1) Providing high-quality pathways for aspiring teachers and principals**

Available

Tier 1

Tier 2

Init

21

19

19

**(D)(1) Reviewer Comments: (Tier 1)**

NY State does have in place the legal and regulatory authority to allow for alternative routes to teacher and principal certification. This authority allows for both IHEs and other providers to administer these alternative routes. Under this authority, several partnerships with external providers that have alternative certification as a key component of their program have developed. A partnership with The New Teacher Project led to the creation of the NYC Teaching Fellows which places new teachers in hard to staff positions and puts them through an alternative certification program, as well as the Math Immersion Program which provides a



special certification route that requires content testing and extra training in teaching math for people with math knowledge but without a math major. Likewise the Intensive Teacher Institutes in Bilingual Education/Special Education are 15-credit programs that prepare teachers through an alternative pathway in these shortage areas. Teacher U, an alternative route that focuses heavily on clinical experiences and meeting the needs of actual teachers working to get their full professional certification, includes close monitoring and support in the classroom and numerous on-site visits by faculty. The Urban Teacher Residency partnership between Hunter College and New Visions represents yet another alternative route that integrates coursework with hands-on experiences and ongoing collaboration with expert educators. For principals, NY has a partnership with New Leaders for New Schools which involves an alternative route to certification coupled with extensive pre- and in-service training as well as an internship year working in an actual school in a leadership capacity. In addition, NY's New York City Leadership Academy is a non-traditional principal preparation program that develops leaders for some of New York's neediest schools. These programs and partnerships demonstrate that NY has alternative routes that are selective, that value supervised school-based experience and ongoing support, which do allow candidates to test out of required coursework and award standard professional certification to completers just as if they had completed a traditional preparation program. NY does have an annual reporting process for determining level of supply and demand but it is not clear that provides all necessary data about shortage areas. The most direct way to assess these areas is to see which subject areas and grade levels have perennial vacancies at the start and midpoint of a school year in the actual LEAs. It is not clear that the system described in the application has that data. Rather, it looks at out of assignment teachers, numbers of certificates issues and new and inexperienced teacher data. This is helpful, but not precise. The application does give numerous examples of state and district level programs and partnerships that have been developed to address shortage areas.

<b>(D)(2) Improving teacher and principal effectiveness based on performance</b>	<b>58</b>	<b>43</b>	<b>34</b>	
(i) Measuring student growth	5	4	3	
(ii) Developing evaluation systems	15	11	9	
(iii) Conducting annual evaluations	10	7	7	
(iv) Using evaluations to inform key decisions	28	21	15	

**(D)(2) Reviewer Comments: (Tier 1)**

NY lays out a clear, though general, plan for developing a statewide value-added model for measuring student growth (and by extension teacher and principal effectiveness scores). In addition it talks generally about a 3 year timeline for development and statewide implementation. All of these activities would be funded by R2T monies. While the plan establishes the required steps, responsible parties, and requisite approach at the general level it lacks a level of detail. For example, convening "contractors, researchers, policy-makers, representatives from collective bargaining groups, and LEAs to design and implement a growth and value-added model for use in making growth calculations in educator evaluations," is an extremely complicated process and the reality of that complexity is not reflected in NY's plan, timeline, or narrative. Given the fact that the LEA MOU for the application clearly states that it cannot override collective bargaining agreements, this issues seems to merit more consideration in the application than it gets. NY State's plan to design and implement new evaluation systems for teachers and principals is a good one. They have a solid foundation in their current system which requires annual evaluations, lays out clear standards areas and emphasizes the link between evaluation and improvement. They have clear steps in place to adopt standardized rating categories and they have committed state and private foundation dollars to support the development and pilot of new evaluation systems for teachers and principals that use multiple measures to generate a single effect score. In addition they once again have the experience, lessons learned and best practices from the NYCDOE system to build on. While the plan does propose the development of a Teacher and Principal Effectiveness Advisory Committee and some collaboration with an AFT-funded initiative to develop teaching standards support standards, it does not do enough to address the involvement of the teachers and principals these new systems will affect most. This involvement will have to be substantial and public if the new system is to take root in a meaningful way. The concept of the



single teacher or principal effect score is also confusing. Read as written this score seems to be based 30-40% on objective student growth data with the remaining 60-70% based on observations comparing the educator to performance standards and/or other more subjective evidence of student growth. This could be problematic because, while unlikely, there is a chance that a teacher or principal could have student growth data showing less than a year's worth of growth on average counting for 40% of the effect score while also having evaluation scores that said performance was good counting for up to 60% of the effect score. This seems to indicate that an educator could get a rating of Effective even if his or her students were not averaging a year's worth of tested growth. NY already requires annual reviews of its teachers and the Regents are moving to revise those requirements to also include the delivery of timely and constructive feedback. The plan details how the State will require LEAs to develop pools of evaluators and how those evaluators will have training opportunities through the state as well as how the State's database will ultimately provide a layer of quality control by linking teacher effect scores to evaluators. A strength of the plan is that it lays out ways in which the State will facilitate collaboration between LEAs as they try to train-up evaluators in the understanding and implementation of this new model. It also explains ways that the data-tracking system will support this effort and how the state will make online resources such as sample teaching lessons and evaluator trainings available anytime online. This will help ensure a level of inter-rater reliability. While there is mention of LEA evaluation data being entered into the statewide tracking system, there is no mention of how the state might monitor that data for an LEA or a school and use it to identify specific professional development needs mapped to a specific standard or standards. Identifying those types of trends – in the lower performing schools or districts at least – and then responding to them by actively providing targeted resources or trainings would be a way that a state department could provide substantive support to the LEAs charged with doing the real work discussed in this section of the application. The plan discusses the connections between those who do evaluation and the state's teacher and principal and career ladder but is not very specific about the connection. This is potentially one of the places where LEAs will have the most problems with their unions (and vice versa) and the State should say more about the role it will play in clarifying the issues here. NY State has a solid overall approach to using evaluations for the further development of teachers and principals. They are relying on the intensive work of districts in the Teacher and Principal Growth and Accountability Incentive Fund to generate a model and best practices for using evaluations to drive embedded and specific professional development and training strategies. Subsequently the dissemination of that work statewide will be conducted through the regional professional development networks which will also be the vehicle by which districts collaborate moving forward to build these systems. In this model the State defers to the LEAs where the actual work will be done and plays a facilitator and support role for the work. They do not mention what, if any, role they would play in helping districts end up with one evaluation system that can be used to hold chronically underperforming teachers accountable as it also simultaneously tries to drive educator growth. In a system like this where the evaluators are also acting as coaches, there are often many questions about how educators can be completely honest or open about their practice and the State should explore what role it could play here. NY's move away from degrees and credits as the basis of its teacher career advancement is in line with research that these are not consistently linked to teacher effectiveness. The State's proposed teacher career ladder embodies a more sound approach to increasing educator responsibilities, professional opportunities and additional compensation. The application does state that this career continuum would be located within the state certification system but does not explain what if any links there would be between certification and the different tiers of the teacher career ladder. This is important because teacher leader positions must be earned through proven ability to consistently increase student learning and a demonstrated ability to work well with adults in coaching and leadership situations. Choosing educators for these positions is ultimately an employment exercise based on the qualifications of available candidates at a point in time. It should never be based on a one-time award of a certificate. NY's application does not seem to directly address D21v c & d. The targets chart does mention collecting data from LEAs on how many employment and tenure decisions are made using evaluation data in the future. But the application does not seem to say directly what role the evaluations should play or how the State would promote a particular use of the evaluations in these instances. However in D4ii, it is clearly stated that professional certification (that needed for ongoing employment at an LEA in the State) is dependent on a teacher showing evidence of raising student achievement over multiple years. This illustrates how NY would use evaluation to control the award of tenure and remove ineffective teachers. It is not as clear for principals.



**(D)(2) Reviewer Comments: (Tier 2)**

This was a key area for follow-up in the Tier 2 Q & A and we talked at length about the State role in supporting the local-level work to develop evaluation systems and use them to make key decisions. The State understandably deferred to the necessity that these issue be dealt with first and foremost at the local level but they failed to adequately outline the role the State DOE would play when these local-level efforts reached impasse or failed to reflect what research and cross-state experience supported as best practice. The team was clear that communication and education was a key piece of how they would deal with this, but they fell short of articulating how the State would be a driver of important reform in the face of logistical, political, or other barriers.

**(D)(3) Ensuring equitable distribution of effective teachers and principals**

25

24

24

(i) Ensuring equitable distribution in high-poverty or high-minority schools

15

14

14

(ii) Ensuring equitable distribution in hard-to-staff subjects and specialty areas

10

10

10

**(D)(3) Reviewer Comments: (Tier 1)**

NY State's plan to ensure the equitable distribution of effective teacher and principals is strong. It targets both the ramp-up of its monitoring and compliance roles by using student growth data to develop a picture of how effective and ineffective teachers are allocated and requiring LEAs to submit plans to address inequities. The plan also seeks to target the problem at its roots by stressing the central role of individualized, data-informed professional development and support for struggling teachers in shortage areas and high needs schools and districts. The State's Office of District Services will assist LEAs in developing their own plans for dealing with these issues and also provided the data systems, tools and resources needed at the building level to try and help struggling and average educators become more effective. The plan also relies on the Teacher and Principal Growth and Accountability Incentive Fund Initiative to help participating LEAs develop best practices around incenting highly effective educators to serve in high need schools that traditionally do not have highly effective teachers in numbers comparable to some of their more affluent counterparts. Similar to plans described in D3i, NYSED intends to use the new data tracking system to edify their monitoring of effective teacher distribution in hard-to-staff subjects. In addition NY plans to pilot a number of new teacher and principal preparation programs in these hard to staff areas and make those pilot models available to IHEs and non-IHE providers. This strategy of casting the net wide reflects the State's grasp of the problems and their sense of urgency around solving them. In that vein, NY also proposes the individualized support and professional development described above for average and under-performing teachers in these hard-to-staff subjects. Earlier in the application, NY described programs specifically designed to address these shortages such as the math immersion program in the NYC Teaching Fellows that show the ongoing commitment to building smart solutions to these problems. The State also describes the role of induction programs for teachers in these areas as well as substantial bonuses for STEM teachers who get results in high need schools and LEA-developed alternative compensation plans. Overall NY's multi-strategy approach demonstrates the states commitment to figure out and go with what works while keeping a clear picture of how the problem looks annually and how it is impacted by these various strategies.

**(D)(4) Improving the effectiveness of teacher and principal preparation programs**

14

12

12

**(D)(4) Reviewer Comments: (Tier 1)**

NY's plans in this area are straightforward. Collect the student data for teachers and principals, link it in the new data system to the programs that prepared them and then develop public reports and make them available. In addition NY proposes the development of a preparation program accountability system. This system seems like a great idea but beyond reporting the kind and quality of educators the programs are producing the application does not say much about how it would hold the preparers accountable. In addition



when explaining the connection of educators' student performance data to programs it says that it will do this for state and city institutions as well as for participating IHEs and non-IHE providers. Given that the teachers in question will need to submit credentials to whatever LEA they work for, the State should be able to report on all preparers and not just those that choose to participate. In sum, the plan seems solid but lacks detail in some of its most important and complicated aspects. NY's plan to expand preparation and credentialing options that are successful at producing effective teachers and principals is bold. It requires evidence of effectiveness for teacher and principal certification, it seeks to develop a model performance assessment tool and process for new teachers seeking initial certification, it will strengthen already existing content tests and add a reading and writing competency subtest. It also proposes to develop teacher residency programs (both at the undergraduate and graduate level) in areas with high concentrations of high needs schools that focus on equipping educators with the tools and clinical experience they need to be successful. Moreover it invites programs and partners that have already had success in producing effective educators that work in high needs schools or shortage areas to apply for state funding to expand. The State is also committed to collecting best practices from all of these programs and using them to inform program redesign on an ongoing basis.

**(D)(5) Providing effective support to teachers and principals**

20

18

18

**(D)(5) Reviewer Comments: (Tier 1)**

A particularly strong strategy that NY has for supporting LEAs in providing high quality professional development is the creation of state-certified Education Diagnostic Teams. This approach is modeled on the success of Uncommon Schools and the State's charter authorizers and seems an effective and scalable approach to helping LEAs and schools reflect on what they need to improve. In addition the State is committed to partnering with external organizations that can help provide quality professional development and setting clear expectations for those partners. In this way the State will leverage outside expertise but manage those relationships in a way that will help build State and LEA capacity. To support quality training and professional development for school leaders, NY is committed to supporting a national network of school leadership training and development organizations as well as Statewide Leadership Academies. This hybrid strategy of leveraging external partners and developing its own solutions and then scaling up what works provides a good plan for supporting quality professional development for educators. NY will also look at local and national best practices in embedded professional development and instructional improvement and use the findings to create an RFP for 10 projects in high need LEAs focused on formative assessment-based professional development. To build capacity for quality job-embedded professional development and provide extra support for new teachers, NY proposes to develop New Teacher Induction Programs focused on creating teacher leaders. All of these initiatives will have a required evaluation component that will be paired with the educator effect data from the project sites to create a picture of which projects are the most effective. This plan proposes a varied array of strategies based on national and local successes. It seeks to scale-up what works and seems realistic given the multi-layered support of the State offices (many created by R2T funding). The application could say more about how program evaluation will look.

Total

138

116

107

**E. Turning Around the Lowest-Achieving Schools**

	Available	Tier 1	Tier 2	Init
<b>(E)(1) Intervening in the lowest-achieving schools and LEAs</b>	10	10	10	

**(E)(1) Reviewer Comments: (Tier 1)**

NY has the authority to intervene directly in persistently low-achieving LEAs and schools. NY manifests this authority in a variety of ways designed to address the differing needs of schools who chronically underperform.



<b>(E)(2) Turning around the lowest-achieving schools</b>	<b>40</b>	<b>32</b>	<b>32</b>
(i) Identifying the persistently lowest-achieving schools	5	3	3
(ii) Turning around the persistently lowest-achieving schools	35	29	29

**(E)(2) Reviewer Comments: (Tier 1)**

NY has a thorough methodology for identifying persistently low-achieving schools. NY has a comprehensive and multi-layered approach to supporting LEAs in working with turnaround schools. Beyond a cogent method for identifying these schools they have an approach that involves multiple layers of support from state and external entities. It does not only focus on episodic help for schools in the turnaround process but rather it tries to couple that assistance with capacity-building in the LEAs. Two State offices combine with a State office run by an external partner (ETACIT) and Joint Intervention Teams to provide the support schools and LEAs need to succeed. These multiple perspectives ensure that LEAs and schools are getting a variety of expertise that will help them choose the appropriate turnaround model and implement it effectively. NYSED uses these offices and array of other resources to assist schools as they choose one of the four models. The State requires that implementation plans and program descriptions are submitted for review and then evaluates those plans for quality. During the implementation, the schools receive technical support and ongoing information reporting along with annual effectiveness evaluations. The State is committed to supporting its LEAs whether they have staff dedicated to supporting turnaround schools and preexisting relationships with external partners or whether they need the State to broker relationships with such partners for them. NYSED's approach allows LEAs to handle turnaround on their own, broker their own partnerships or turn to a pool of partners developed by the state through an RFP process for help. The approach borrows from the zone/cluster concept and best practices of education management organizations that share information. In an effort to support continued innovation that produces new successful turnaround models, NY is also launching a secondary schools innovation incentive fund as well. In addition, NY is exploring the role of online and virtual schooling in turnaround schools serving at-risk youth. Overall, NY's plan is multi-faceted, comprehensive, rooted in research and best practice, and realistic. The identification of only 57 persistently low-achieving schools - out of approximately 4000 - raises a credibility issue. Addressing only 57 schools in this pool of 4000 might be realistic but may not be ambitious.

<b>Total</b>	<b>50</b>	<b>42</b>	<b>42</b>
--------------	-----------	-----------	-----------

**F. General**

	<b>Available</b>	<b>Tier 1</b>	<b>Tier 2</b>	<b>Init</b>
<b>(F)(1) Making education funding a priority</b>	<b>10</b>	<b>7</b>	<b>7</b>	

**(F)(1) Reviewer Comments: (Tier 1)**

Education expenditure increased from 2008 – 2009. NY's Foundation Formula is a multi-step calculation designed to ensure equity among LEAs that takes into account need, the LEA ability to contribute to cost, and overall student achievement levels. The aim is for the State to distribute aid on the basis of which districts have the biggest differential between cost and ability to cover as well as overall student need. In addition NY requires LEAs that receive significant State funds to sign a contract that, in part, requires those districts to allocate State funds in a way that prioritizes those schools in the greatest need. The question remains what policy was or is in place to address equity in NY right now and what are the results? In addition, why does the economic crisis in the State result in a delay for the phase-in of the foundation funding formula?

<b>(F)(2) Ensuring successful conditions for high-performing charter schools and other innovative schools</b>	<b>40</b>	<b>29</b>	<b>24</b>	
---	-----------	-----------	-----------	--



**(F)(2) Reviewer Comments: (Tier 1)**

NY laws caps the number of start-up charters at 200. There is no cap on conversions, no cap on enrollment and no de facto cap created through funding. NY has a nationally recognized level of rigor for authorizing and re-authorizing charters that requires the setting and reaching of student achievement targets and they closed 10% of the number of total schools opened since 04-05 in that same period. NY law encourages the creation of charters with populations that reflect the local community and prioritize SWDs and ELLs as well as a de facto charge to prioritize at-risk students (75% of all students attending in 2008). Per pupil funding in charter schools is 100% of what regular public school pupil funding is for instructional costs (excluding capital expenses, cafeteria etc.) but lagged two years. NY does not provide any dedicated funding to charters for facilities. NY does have a Charter Schools Stimulus Fund, makes provisions for charters to share school space with regular schools, and NYCDOE actively assists charters with obtaining space. Charter can participate in Federal school bond programs. NY's approach to charters is mixed. They are rigorous in awarding charters and will close those that don't measure up. They cap start-ups but not conversions. They give "full" funding but the definition of full is qualified. They do not provide facilities directly but there are multiple mechanisms to support them in this area. There are examples of innovation and autonomy in the State outside of the charter schools that is allowed if not facilitated by the State and or LEAs - though the extent to which this is true is not clear. (E.g. staffing autonomy can only occur in union free districts.)

**(F)(2) Reviewer Comments: (Tier 2)**

NY has a hard cap on start-up charter schools. When asked to comment on the cap, the NY team's response was not convincing enough to allay fears that, as a state, NY lacks the collective will to make critical changes to existing laws that act as impediments to substantive reform. A limit of 200 start-up charters in a state with over 4500 schools, coupled with the lack of a convincing rationale for such a cap, is significant and cause for a further deduction in this area.

**(F)(3) Demonstrating other significant reform conditions**

5

3

3

**(F)(3) Reviewer Comments: (Tier 1)**

NY's integrated PK-16 governance structure provides a favorable condition for reform. The Regents leverage their authority over NY's cultural institutions to provide valuable partnerships among schools and museums and universities. The examples provided indicate some evidence for favorable conditions but not overwhelming.

Total

55

39

34

**Competitive Preference Priority 2: Emphasis on STEM**

	Available	Tier 1	Tier 2	Init
Competitive Preference Priority 2: Emphasis on STEM	15	15	15	

**Competitive Reviewer Comments: (Tier 1)**

NY successfully addresses STEM education throughout its application and the four assurance areas. When listed out, the proposed plans and strategies touching on STEM education in each of the areas, a plan emerges that offers a rigorous STEM course of study, cooperation with external partners to enrich STEM education and the capacity of STEM educators, and opportunities for more students to get a high quality education in a STEM area. This plan also has strategies for making the pool of students taking a STEM course of study more diverse. It should be noted that the application does not address the needs of underrepresented groups and of women and girls. While NY still gets the STEM priority, it must be noted that this point was ignored.



Total	15	15	15
-------	----	----	----

### Absolute Priority - Comprehensive Approach to Education Reform

	Available	Tier 1	Tier 2	Init
Absolute Priority - Comprehensive Approach to Education Reform		Yes	Yes	

#### Absolute Reviewer Comments: (Tier 1)

The State's application comprehensively and coherently addresses all of the four education reform areas specified in the ARRA. It also meets the State Success Factors Criteria. The State has sufficient LEA participation and commitment to successfully implement and achieve the goals in its plans. The application adequately describes how the State, in collaboration with its participating LEAs, will use Race to the Top and other funds to increase student achievement, decrease the achievement gaps across student subgroups, and increase the rates at which students graduate from high school prepared for college and careers. NY's application builds on the significant innovation already underway in the state and it proposes ways to scale-up successful practices. Their contention that addressing these weaknesses and building on their strengths as they address the four assurance areas will lead to continued increases in student achievement and narrowing of the achievement gap is convincing.

Total		0	0
-------	--	---	---

Grand Total	500	398	383
-------------	-----	-----	-----





# Race to the Top

## Technical Review Form - Tier 2

New York Application #4800NY-4



### A. State Success Factors

	Available	Tier 1	Tier 2	Init
<b>(A)(1) Articulating State's education reform agenda and LEA's participation in it</b>	<b>65</b>	<b>62</b>	<b>62</b>	
(i) Articulating comprehensive, coherent reform agenda	5	5	5	
(ii) Securing LEA commitment	45	43	43	
(iii) Translating LEA participation into statewide impact	15	14	14	

#### (A)(1) Reviewer Comments: (Tier 1)

A 1 i New York has indeed set forth a comprehensive and coherent reform agenda. It obviously has a firm grasp on, and has clearly laid out, the important elements of providing students with successful schooling – outstanding preparation programs, standards, curriculum, data-driven instruction and professional development – as well as the needed structural changes for that to occur. Worth noting is the State's willingness to learn from, involve and take advice from charter schools and its understanding of, and intent to, greatly expand technology use to substantially improve the productivity of its system. A 1 ii Of the Participating LEAs, New York received signatures from 100% of the Superintendents, 92% of the School Board Presidents and 61% of the Union Leaders. Nearly 100% of the Participating LEAs signed on to all but three elements of the State's plan. A 1 iii New York received commitment from 66% of its LEAs, that percentage representing 40% of its schools, 82% of its students and 94% of its students in poverty. However, between one-fourth and one-fifth of the participating LEAs are charter schools. That factor plus the fact that over one-third of the Union Leaders refused to sign on might raise concerns about the extent of impact that RTT can have in the State. Nevertheless, the public school LEAs that did commit represent a large portion of the state's students and those LEAs who considered signing on but only with qualifications (and were not included in the count) will be permitted to reconsider in the coming weeks and resubmit an MOU. Also, New York believes that the effects of the proposed reforms on student performance will be seen almost immediately in the 2010-2011 school year. These factors plus the far-reaching immediate penetration of New York's planned increased technology use should enable the State to have a broad statewide impact.

<b>(A)(2) Building strong statewide capacity to implement, scale up, and sustain proposed plans</b>	<b>30</b>	<b>28</b>	<b>30</b>	
(i) Ensuring the capacity to implement	20	20	20	
(ii) Using broad stakeholder support	10	8	10	

#### (A)(2) Reviewer Comments: (Tier 1)

A 2 i New York has nationally recognized leaders in educational reform fields who are on the Board of Regents and administering the State Department of Education. These are the individuals who will be at the helm of implementing RTT. There is also a planned transformation of the State Department. In addition, New York can call upon various Department agencies, some new (The Office of Innovative School Models, External Technical Assistance Center for Innovation and Turnaround, NYSED Research Group, NYSED Office of External Partnerships) and the regional BOCES, all of which will provide the leadership, capacity



and effective operations to strongly support participating LEAs in the work that lies ahead. New York has given ample examples of how it will coordinate and/or repurpose funds from various sources to accomplish the State's plan and it's implicit that the realignment of these funds will help to continue the reforms after the grant funding has ended. A 2 ii Over a three-month period, New York met with nearly 200 individuals and groups from a wide-range of stakeholders, but apparently no representatives from business and industry - the ones who not only are the recipients of any district's graduates but also the ones called upon to fund various programs. Also there were no letters of support included in the appendix. The feedback and support that was received will definitely be helpful in implementing RTT.

**(A)(2) Reviewer Comments: (Tier 2)**

Beccause of a technical error by the USDOE, the letters of support were not available to us during Tier 1. We received them during Tier 2.

<b>(A)(3) Demonstrating significant progress in raising achievement and closing gaps</b>	<b>30</b>	<b>30</b>	<b>30</b>	
(i) Making progress in each reform area	5	5	5	
(ii) Improving student outcomes	25	25	25	

**(A)(3) Reviewer Comments: (Tier 1)**

A 3 i New York has presented an impressive list of accomplishments in regard to the four reform areas including many programs that the State has funded. A 3 ii New York detailed several examples of improving student achievement over the last several years, attributing the progress to a 2005 Regents plan. Students' scores have increased significantly on state tests and students with disabilities are doing better. New York included several examples of instances where the various gaps have been closed and the latest NAEP scores show that New York narrowed proportionately more of its gaps than other states did. New York's graduation rates have risen with the minority graduation rate, increasing 12 points when the overall graduation rate increased 10%.

<b>Total</b>	<b>125</b>	<b>120</b>	<b>122</b>	
--------------	------------	------------	------------	--

**B. Standards and Assessments**

	<b>Available</b>	<b>Tier 1</b>	<b>Tier 2</b>	<b>Init</b>
<b>(B)(1) Developing and adopting common standards</b>	<b>40</b>	<b>40</b>	<b>40</b>	
(i) Participating in consortum developing high-quality standards	20	20	20	
(ii) Adopting standards	20	20	20	

**(B)(1) Reviewer Comments: (Tier 1)**

B 1 i New York has demonstrated its commitment to adopting high-quality standards that will be internationally benchmarked in that it is participating in not one but three consortia that are working to develop a common set of standards, one of which has 36 states involved. It has a very thorough plan to adopt standards that includes: calling in experts to discuss them, launching a website solely for the purpose of sharing and publicizing them, releasing feedback, and having a live audience discussion. New York will also develop new standards for Economics, Arts and Technology. Governor Paterson and Commissioner Mills signed the National Governors Association and The Chief State School Officers' Memorandum of Agreement with 48 states, two territories and the District of Columbia committing to a common core of standards that will ensure college and career readiness for English and math in grades K-12. A copy of the draft standards is included in the application. B 1 ii The New York State Board of Regents has approved a process that will enable them to review and adopt the Common Core Standards by July 2010.



(B)(2) Developing and implementing common, high-quality assessments	10	10	10
(B)(2) Reviewer Comments: (Tier 1)			
B 2 New York has joined three consortia – Balanced Assessment, Assessment Consortium and SMARTER and has produced the evidence required to fully meet this criterion. Balanced Assessment Consortium has more than 26 participating states; it has 37.			
(B)(3) Supporting the transition to enhanced standards and high-quality assessments	20	19	19
(B)(3) Reviewer Comments: (Tier 1)			
B3 New York's plans for transitioning to new enhanced standards include first adopting the Common Core Standards by July 2010 and then developing curriculum frameworks. Subsequently, it will issue two RFPs for assessments in December, 2010. New York is partnering with other states to develop the assessments. At the same time, in collaboration with the field, it will also develop back-up standards of its own as it realizes that these consortia are newly organized and may not be able to timely meet their goal of producing the called-for assessments. The proposal may have been a little weak on involving its participating LEAs in setting standards. The Board of Regents has had a Working Group focusing on vertically aligning its assessments with college and career requirements and the Board will approve an alignment upon the Working Group's recommendations. It also anticipates that assessments for Science, Economics (including Statistics), Multi Media, Arts and Social Studies will be established and that they will be tied to career, college and workforce competencies.			
Total	70	69	69

### C. Data Systems to Support Instruction

	Available	Tier 1	Tier 2	Init
(C)(1) Fully implementing a statewide longitudinal data system	24	10	10	
(C)(1) Reviewer Comments: (Tier 1)				
C 1 New York's longitudinal data system does not include seven of the America COMPETES elements.				
(C)(2) Accessing and using State data	5	5	5	
(C)(2) Reviewer Comments: (Tier 1)				
C 2 New York's plan to ensure that data collected is accessible and used is quite thorough and includes unifying P-16 course codes and early warning systems. It also includes implementing a comprehensive reporting system to be phased in over three years that will allow users to customize the user experience, prioritize the display of useful information and utilize the latest social media technologies to save and share information with others. New York is committed to incorporating best practices from other states and organizations such as Kentucky's easy to read and interpret reports that it shares with high schools to show them how their graduates perform in postsecondary education (not clear whether this information is available on individual students or just classes or sub groups). New York will create relevant, simple reports and make them easily accessible not only to teachers and administrators but also to parents and other advocates. It will work to raise awareness of the availability of the data so that all key stakeholders know that it exists and that they can access it. It will also develop and use a growth model, integrate all levels by emulating Florida's data warehouse system that connects K-12, postsecondary, and workforce information (Pre-K level was not included here). It will work with representatives of early childhood and non-education stakeholders to link systems.				



(C)(3) Using data to improve instruction	18	18	18
--	----	----	----

**(C)(3) Reviewer Comments: (Tier 1)**

C 3 i New York plans to build upon New York City's system which provides 80,000 educators with the ability to analyze data they can use to improve student outcomes, share what works by publishing documents, take part in discussions and blogs and work with other educators facing similar challenges. The parents of 1.1 million students can log-in to access secure, individualized reports on their children. New York's system will also permit viewing performance on individual assessment items, diagnose students' learning needs and set appropriate improvement goals and access a library of instructional resources that are research-based and proven to work. Given all of the above, New York has demonstrated that it has a high-quality plan to meet this criterion. C 3 ii New York plans to use an Inquiry Team model that includes tiered layers of leaders plus experts in data, curriculum, assessment and instruction and make them responsible for school-based inquiry teams. This model is data- and evidence-driven, emphasizes principal leadership and teacher cooperation and is sustainable. It makes time for teachers to work actively together to analyze the data and make adjustments in their instruction as needed. New York City is currently using this model. (While the narrative reports that this approach has been successful in California, it does not include an estimate of New York City's satisfaction with it.) By June, 2012, the use of this system in all New York's schools will have been promoted. By 2012, the system will report on results of student monitoring to determine whether or not students are on-track toward high-school graduation and meeting postsecondary goals. By June 2013, all schools will be required to use this system and participation will be part of the determination of whether or not they make adequate yearly progress. C 3 iii By June, 2011, New York will have an expedited process to provide data to researchers who need de-identified student-level data, depending on the nature and justification of the request. Student privacy will be ensured. Given all of the above, New York has demonstrated that it has a high-quality plan to meet this criterion.

Total	47	33	33
-------	----	----	----

**D. Great Teachers and Leaders**

	Available	Tier 1	Tier 2	Init
(D)(1) Providing high-quality pathways for aspiring teachers and principals	21	21	21	

**(D)(1) Reviewer Comments: (Tier 1)**

D1 i New York law gives the Regents broad authority to approve alternative routes to certification for teachers and principals and that includes the authority to allow for providers other than institutions of higher education D 1 ii New York has more than met this criterion as it has enthusiastically endorsed alternative routes - mostly out of need to fill some of the many thousands of positions it has and the State has in place a variety of pathways - 67 in all. It employed 1399 alternatively certified teachers in 2007 and that number had grown to 2669 in 2008. The focus seems to be on only teachers although principals are mentioned in an appendix and there seems to be no shortage areas for them. D1 iii New York has a comprehensive system for identifying areas of teacher shortages and has approved many alternative routes to prepare practitioners to fill these vacancies. It disperses funds from a \$25 million annual State appropriation to attract hard-to-staff teachers and hold regular meetings with Deans of Colleges of Education to promote expansion of programs in shortage areas. The State also funded the development of three new programs in response to areas of need that were identified in the RTT proposal: a clinically-rich Graduate Preparation Program; STEM/ELL/Students with Disabilities with differential pay incentives; and an expedited pathway for those with advanced degrees in the STEM areas.

(D)(2) Improving teacher and principal effectiveness based on performance	58	47	47
(i) Measuring student growth	5	5	5



(ii) Developing evaluation systems	15	15	15
(iii) Conducting annual evaluations	10	10	10
(iv) Using evaluations to inform key decisions	28	17	17

**(D)(2) Reviewer Comments: (Tier 1)**

D 2 i New York will incorporate student growth and value-added measurements into its already strong assessment system enabling it to meet the following deadlines: 2010-11 – develop value-added metrics in currently-tested grades and subjects; 2011-12 – pilot these in a small set of LEAs; 2012-13 – implement statewide. D 2 ii At their December 2009 meeting, the Regents approved a policy requiring LEAs to implement four rating categories when evaluating teachers and by Fall 2010, all participating LEAs will be required to use these rating levels in their teacher evaluations. A pilot program will be in place in 2010-2011 to link individual student achievement and growth to the teacher responsible for instruction and the principal responsible for supervising instruction. Statewide roll out will occur in 2013. In December 2009, the Regents approved the use of student growth data in principals' evaluations and the Principal Performance Evaluation System is being redesigned to include that growth factor and the four qualitative rating categories for teachers. By Fall of 2010, the redesigned evaluations will be used by all participating LEAs. New York will design and develop its evaluation system with teacher and principal involvement as evidenced by its formation of a Value-Added Model Advisory Committee that will include LEA representatives and a Teacher and Principal Effectiveness Advisory Committee. It will also collaborate with union representatives to develop teaching standards and standards for system support. D 2 iii New York already conducts annual evaluations and by spring of 2010, the Regents will stipulate that performance reviews for all teachers include timely and constructive feedback. It will further stipulate that teachers be provided with student achievement and growth data for their students on a timely basis. D 2 iv a For all participating LEAs, incentive fund dollars will be used to support differentiated professional development closely linked to student growth data, identify coaches and mentors using effectiveness ratings tied to student growth and build feedback loops between professional development and teacher effectiveness. b) c) and d) At their December 2009 meeting, Regents approved a new approach to teacher career advancement focused on effectiveness. As a result, New York has designed a 4-step career ladder. Additional compensation will be offered in the form of bonuses based on individual performance evaluation, lowering the achievement gap and teaching in high-needs schools or subjects. The narrative did not discuss tenure, but the career ladder design that was included shows tenure continuing to be granted after just three years. The proposal was silent on removing ineffective teachers.

<b>(D)(3) Ensuring equitable distribution of effective teachers and principals</b>	<b>25</b>	<b>25</b>	<b>25</b>
(i) Ensuring equitable distribution in high-poverty or high-minority schools	15	15	15
(ii) Ensuring equitable distribution in hard-to-staff subjects and specialty areas	10	10	10

**(D)(3) Reviewer Comments: (Tier 1)**

D 3 i To ensure equitable distribution of highly effective teachers, New York will develop the capacity of LEAs to use newly designed evaluations, including differentiating effectiveness and linked to student growth to make them more aware of the distribution inequities. Participating LEAs will be required to submit reports and plans on resolving within-district inequities for review by the State. The Office of Accountability will conduct surveys of LEAs that have an equitable distribution of teachers to identify promising practices and strategies and use those results to measure and address the problem. The State will use incentive pay to attract and assign identified highly effective teachers and principals (as determined by the new differentiated evaluations) to high-need schools. Altogether, the State has developed a high-quality plan. D 3 ii New York has made great progress in reducing the percentages of teachers without appropriate certification, but it is aware that it is not preparing nearly enough teachers in some categories to fill shortages. It proposes to:



strengthen its monitoring of the percentage of effective teachers in hard-to-staff subjects and specialty areas to create awareness and urgency of need; redesign teacher and principal preparation programs to make sure institutions are graduating students with the needed content knowledge and skills and initiate some new programs to help fill various needs such as one for STEM/ELL/Students with Disabilities. Among other steps, it will request a Regents' policy on developing new and expedited certification routes for persons with Doctoral degrees in STEM disciplines to teach in high-need middle and high schools and for certifying professors and college instructors in STEM disciplines. It will invest in differentiated professional development and on-line offerings to make high-quality pedagogical programs more accessible. And, it will develop a differential pay incentive for high-need, highly effective teachers. Beginning in summer 2010, eligible teachers will receive \$30,000 in bonuses over five years to teach STEM subjects and other hard-to-staff subjects in high-need middle and high schools. It would be of interest to know what New York did to reduce the percentages of teachers without proper certification and how those actions informed the steps they propose to fill shortages.

(D)(4) Improving the effectiveness of teacher and principal preparation programs	14	14	14
--	----	----	----

**(D)(4) Reviewer Comments: (Tier 1)**

D 4 i New York has a high-quality plan to meet this criterion. It will develop institutional performance profiles for each credentialing program in the State – 4,836 of them – and make them public. It will hold these programs accountable for: performance of their graduates on their certification examinations; percent of graduates certified/employed in shortage subjects; percent of graduates employed in high-need schools and performance of their graduates positively affecting student achievement (including sub groups). D 4 ii While New York will expand programs including those of non-collegiate providers with appropriate expertise that successfully prepare principals, it is not focused as much on expanding credentialing options for teachers as it already has numerous credentialing options for them and has placed thousands of alternatively certified teachers in schools. It will concentrate on greatly improving preparation at existing institutions. It has a high-quality plan to do that including features such as: very selectively recruiting candidates and placing them in a year-long, tuition-free residency program which they must successfully complete before being certified; expecting participating institutions of higher education to show how the work of their faculty in these new programs will be factored into tenure and promotion decisions; not granting Professional Certificates to candidates who have not increased student achievement over multiple years (meaning they will not be able to teach); funding the expansion of programs with track records of preparing and supporting teachers who have significantly increased high-needs student achievement; and requiring much more rigorous assessment of knowledge and skills that research links to classroom effectiveness including the ability to disaggregate and analyze data.

(D)(5) Providing effective support to teachers and principals	20	20	20
---	----	----	----

**(D)(5) Reviewer Comments: (Tier 1)**

D 5 i New York has presented an elaborate plan to provide effective professional development opportunities, one that will rely on its rich source of external organizations, national experts, and internal agencies to form a robust network capable of delivering the necessary services to improve practitioner performance. It will also partner with ten other states. Its plan stresses the need for setting clear expectations and the importance of providing teachers with strong content knowledge and the ability to: manage data-driven instruction, use formative assessments to inform instruction and integrate the latest technologies into their teaching. D 5 ii All professional development-funded projects will be evaluated annually and the frequency and participation in them as well as the effect on teacher instruction and student growth will be documented. The evaluations will determine whether or not the programs merit continuation, further investment and dissemination statewide.

Total	138	127	127
-------	-----	-----	-----



## E. Turning Around the Lowest-Achieving Schools

	Available	Tier 1	Tier 2	Init
(E)(1) Intervening in the lowest-achieving schools and LEAs	10	10	10	

### (E)(1) Reviewer Comments: (Tier 1)

E 1 New York law 210, 211-b and 211-c and Commissioner's regulations 100.2 highlight the State's legal authority to intervene directly in the State's persistently lowest-achieving schools and LEAs.

(E)(2) Turning around the lowest-achieving schools	40	38	40	
(i) Identifying the persistently lowest-achieving schools	5	5	5	
(ii) Turning around the persistently lowest-achieving schools	35	33	35	

### (E)(2) Reviewer Comments: (Tier 1)

E 2 i New York has been identifying persistently lowest-achieving schools since 1989. Since that time 312 schools have been identified. It has benefited from those experiences and knows where improvements are needed in these procedures. Its plan is a strong one that will strengthen and broaden its efforts in this regard. E 2 ii New York's plan is very thorough and benefits from the State's past efforts in this area, enabling it to know where pitfalls are and to understand just what all it will take to successfully turn schools around. It has learned that LEAs have to have the capacity to do the job and especially they have to have the support to build that capacity. Accordingly, New York is reorganizing offices and assigning them with specific tasks necessary to the endeavor. The plan identifies the full array of technical services that will be made available to LEAs and it's difficult to imagine what could possibly be missing from what they might need. The plan has an accountability component that includes an annual evaluation of the intervention efforts of participating LEAs with low-performing schools. Even with all this commitment and planned support, the proposal estimates the State will be engaged in turning around 0 schools in just a very few years, but offers lacks explanation of how they arrive at that ambitious estimate.

### (E)(2) Reviewer Comments: (Tier 2)

There was a typo in this reviewer's Tier 1 comments. New York will be engaging with 57 schools. After the Tier 2 discussion, it is clear that that number complies with the USDOE's guidelines to be followed in this regard.

Total	50	48	50	
-------	----	----	----	--

## F. General

	Available	Tier 1	Tier 2	Init
(F)(1) Making education funding a priority	10	10	10	

### (F)(1) Reviewer Comments: (Tier 1)

F 1 i New York did increase the percentage of its state funding from FY 2008 to FY 2009. F 1 ii In 2007-2008, New York adopted a new approach to funding education referred to as Foundation Aid and the State's policies do lead to equitable funding. New York's new funding model is based on the Augenblick model of determining an appropriate per-pupil amount and then distributing more funds to districts identified as high-need. New York has developed a Need Resource Capacity to measure districts' relative need. It is based on free and reduced-price lunch data and census poverty data in relation to the resource capacity



existing in a district – the district's ability to raise revenues locally. The result is an equalization of funding, e.g., less wealthy districts enrolling 54.5% of students, but receiving 66.6% of aid.

**(F)(2) Ensuring successful conditions for high-performing charter schools and other innovative schools**

40

23

23

**(F)(2) Reviewer Comments: (Tier 1)**

F 2 i While New York maintains that its cap on charters does not inhibit the growth in them these facts remain: One, there is a cap. Two, the cap results in a low percentage of New York's 4,540 schools being charters, even given the State's references to its hospitable approach to these schools. Three, while it is pointed out that there is no cap on the number of charters that public schools can grant, the narrative states that these charters may be, not must be granted if a majority of parents vote to convert the school into a charter. It's not difficult to imagine the overwhelming task it would be to a) get a majority of parents to agree and b) get permission from local school boards who, for obvious reasons, are going to be reluctant to grant any charters but especially a conversion charter as they would be firing themselves. That there are only 6 of these in a state the size of New York attests to the difficulty of exercising this provision of the law. F 2 ii The State prides itself on its clear and stringent guidelines and laws regarding the authorization and monitoring of Charter Schools. It cites two national reports recognizing New York for its quality control of these schools and the criterion does stipulate that this review be in regard to "high-performing" charter schools. However, considering the low percentage of charter schools allowed in the state as noted above, the modest number of applications in the last five years and the percent of them that were denied: two-thirds in 2004-05; one-third in 2005-06; no applications in 2006-07; a little under half in 2007-2008 and 40% in 2008-2009. In addition, the seemingly strong pressure applied to applicants to enroll a healthy percentage of subgroups to receive authorization (meaning greater than, not similar to, their percentages in the local district student population), there is concern that the rigor that is being applied to the authorization and monitoring of charter schools, while helping to ensure their success, might be causing the State's approach to serve as a deterrent to a reasonable number of charters and the growth and types of them. F 2 iii While the formula for Charter Schools differs from that of regular public schools somewhat, it provides that Charters receive similar funding amounts. F 2 iv The State provides several kinds of facilities assistance for Charter Schools but does not provide funds to purchase or lease facilities. F 2 v The State enables LEAs to operate innovative autonomous public schools. However, in a large state like New York, only two examples were given.

**(F)(3) Demonstrating other significant reform conditions**

5

5

5

**(F)(3) Reviewer Comments: (Tier 1)**

F 3 New York has demonstrated other conditions favorable to education reform or innovation. Of interest is that New York has been operating early college high schools since 1974.

Total

55

38

38

**Competitive Preference Priority 2: Emphasis on STEM**

	Available	Tier 1	Tier 2	Init
Competitive Preference Priority 2: Emphasis on STEM	15	15	15	

**Competitive Reviewer Comments: (Tier 1)**

New York has demonstrated throughout its proposal that will address all aspects of the STEM priority. Throughout its proposal, New York embedded its strong commitment to the development of STEM. It incorporates strategies and recommendations from several regional and national initiatives such as The Empire State STEM Education Progressive Dialogue led by Rensselaer Polytechnic Institute that included the input of over 500 stakeholders including over 40 businesses and has aligned them with the four



assurance sections. For Enhanced Standards and Assessments, it will: implement the new Common Core math standards, revise its science standards and assessments, once established by the consortium; establish new standards and assessments in technology and provide aligned curriculum frameworks for STEM.

Total	15	15	15
-------	----	----	----

### Absolute Priority - Comprehensive Approach to Education Reform

	Available	Tier 1	Tier 2	Init
Absolute Priority - Comprehensive Approach to Education Reform		Yes	Yes	

#### Absolute Reviewer Comments: (Tier 1)

New York State has developed an aggressive plan that covers all the reform areas. It has set targets for strengthening the State's overall education infrastructure that will include making specific improvements in state learning standards. These improvements will, in turn, drive better instruction and increased student achievement. To reduce the achievement gap, New York will increase early childhood opportunities, put a stronger focus on outcomes for students with disabilities and English Language Learners and deliver more equitable distribution of teaching talent. It will also reduce barriers to teaching and learning in high needs schools by establishing education, health and mental health collaborations. Of course, all of these steps will also lead to increased graduation rates. It also plans customized pathways to high school completion. The State will greatly expand its use of technology to improve data collection that will inform the entire spectrum of planned reforms. In addition, New York will create several new statewide virtual schools and online courses to enable students to earn more credits and access courses that will encourage college attendance. The above listing does not do justice to all that is planned but helps to demonstrate New York's commitment to comprehensive reform.

Total		0	0
Grand Total	500	450	454





# Race to the Top

## Technical Review Form - Tier 2

### New York Application #4800NY-5



#### A. State Success Factors

	Available	Tier 1	Tier 2	Init
(A)(1) Articulating State's education reform agenda and LEA's participation in it	65	53	46	
(i) Articulating comprehensive, coherent reform agenda	5	4	4	
(ii) Securing LEA commitment	45	37	30	
(iii) Translating LEA participation into statewide impact	15	12	12	

#### (A)(1) Reviewer Comments: (Tier 1)

(i) New York has generally set forth a comprehensive and coherent reform agenda that clearly articulates its goals for implementing reforms in the four education areas described in the ARRA and improving student outcomes statewide, that largely establishes a clear and credible path to achieving these goals, and is consistent with the specific reform plans that the State has proposed throughout its application. Some highlights include state's understanding of the potential for proven CMOs to have a larger impact on raising student achievement, the focus on providing a strong virtual school option, bringing in external partners to drive turnaround work, and certifying teachers only after they have demonstrated their effectiveness in raising student achievement. The state has also set aggressive targets around NAEP improvement. One drawback is that it is not clear that the state is ambitious enough in intervening aggressively in a larger number of failing schools. An aspect of the application that is particularly strong is that the applicant lays out detailed timelines and action plans for implementation of most initiatives. Moreover, applicant does well when it attempts to make it clear that the people charged with implementation have the qualifications and capacity to do so successfully. As for the charter school law, the applicant does in effect have a cap, which is not consistent with the goals of this grant program. (4/5) (ii) The participating LEAs are strongly committed to the State's plans and to effective implementation of reform in the four education areas, as evidenced by their signing on to the standard MOU, the terms of which reflect strong commitment by the participating LEAs. Applicant has signatures of the participating superintendents and an adequate number of school board presidents, but there is a notable absence of strong union support across the state for this application. A part of the reason that there are only 258 of 551 signatures of union leaders has to do with the fact that the signature was not applicable, but a significant number of LEAs did not actually get the union to support the reform plan. (iii) The applicant appears to have calculation errors in the summary table of participating LEAs in the appendix, in particular regarding the participation of NYC public schools. Provided NYC is in fact participating (as appears to be the case given the table on p. 33), applicant has a chance of translating LEA participation into statewide impact, as it appears that while a larger number of LEAs choosing to participate would be desirable, the percentage of students covered by participating LEAs is in fact large, at 82%. Moreover, the percentage of students in poverty statewide who are educated by participating LEAs is even larger at 94%. State has set ambitious, yet achievable goals, overall and by student subgroup, for raising student achievement. As noted above, the fact that many of the unions have not signed on to support the reform plans could inhibit the ability to achieve statewide impact.

#### (A)(1) Reviewer Comments: (Tier 2)

Despite checking the box that the applicant's MOU uses the standard terms and conditions, the state did not in fact use the standard MOU. The applicant added language that may lead to an outcome such that the



plan is not fully implemented. These terms do not reflect the strongest level of commitment by the participating LEAs.

<b>(A)(2) Building strong statewide capacity to implement, scale up, and sustain proposed plans</b>	<b>30</b>	<b>21</b>	<b>24</b>
(i) Ensuring the capacity to implement	20	16	16
(ii) Using broad stakeholder support	10	5	8

**(A)(2) Reviewer Comments: (Tier 1)**

(i) Applicant demonstrates that it largely has the capacity to implement the strategies laid out in the plan by describing its distinguished senior leadership team, which includes expertise in leading successful charter schools that have shown to be able to close achievement gaps. By explaining how the NYSED will change from being an agency that merely monitors compliance, to one that provides service and support to LEAs, applicant clarifies that it understands the need to be actively involved in improving educational opportunities at the local level. Applicant does well to describe the qualifications of some of the key implementation leadership but also recognizes that there may be need to bring in external consultants to enhance implementation capacity. The applicant distinguishes itself by citing the role of the NYSED Research Support group, which "will package and disseminate information about proven best practices and successful, scalable models." The state's project budget generally lays out a credible plan for using the funds for this grant to accomplish the State's plans and meet its targets. There is some concern that the applicant has not been as careful as it might have been in its use of public funds, as is demonstrated, for example, by the inclusion of the purchase of multiple executive chairs at \$550 each and a bookcase at \$3000. (ii) Applicant's use of subappendices makes it difficult to find key information supporting the application; in particular, it appears that applicant left out the letters of support, to which it refers multiple times. Applicant does summarize the letters of support by saying that it received 98 letters covering a range of stakeholders. Without the actual letters, it is difficult to assess this criterion because the strength and nature of the commitment of these stakeholders.

**(A)(2) Reviewer Comments: (Tier 2)**

Applicant did in fact provide the letters of support, which were not initially available due to a technical problem. Many, but not all of these letters reflect a strong commitment from partners.

<b>(A)(3) Demonstrating significant progress in raising achievement and closing gaps</b>	<b>30</b>	<b>21</b>	<b>21</b>
(i) Making progress in each reform area	5	4	4
(ii) Improving student outcomes	25	17	17

**(A)(3) Reviewer Comments: (Tier 1)**

(i) Applicant has made good progress over the past several years in each of the four education reform areas, including: raising standards and testing requirements; improving the consequences for failure of high school exit exams; enhancing the data system to tie student results to teachers and principals; and inviting outside teacher quality organizations to recruit and prepare talented individuals to the teacher corps and to fill hard-to-staff positions. Moreover, the fact that the state has over 150 charter schools shows that it is working to offer alternative educational options for students. Applicant lays out at length the alignment between funding sources and these improvements in each reform area. As for intervening in chronically low-performing schools, the state does not appear to have taken a sufficiently aggressive approach, however. (ii) State has improved student outcomes since 2003 in some but not all subjects and grades. Applicant does well to offer data in a national context and to provide high-quality external research to support its claims that it is having success in closing some achievement gaps on NAEP. Applicant provides a detailed analysis of state test improvement patterns. The graduation rate has improved in New York but is still low;



graduation rates among certain subgroups and city student populations have improved, but not uniformly or dramatically.

Total	125	95	91
-------	-----	----	----

## B. Standards and Assessments

	Available	Tier 1	Tier 2	Init
<b>(B)(1) Developing and adopting common standards</b>	<b>40</b>	<b>38</b>	<b>38</b>	
(i) Participating in consortium developing high-quality standards	20	20	20	
(ii) Adopting standards	20	18	18	

### (B)(1) Reviewer Comments: (Tier 1)

(i) The State has demonstrated its commitment to adopting a common set of high-quality standards by participating in a consortium of states (CCSSO and NGA) that is working toward jointly developing and adopting a common set of K-12 standards that are supported by evidence that they are internationally benchmarked and build toward college and career readiness by the time of high school graduation. Applicant is one of 48 states to sign the MOA for the Common Core. (ii) Applicant provides timeline for adoption within the designated time frame and evidence that the Board, which has legal authority to revise and adopt standards, has signed on and committed to the process. Applicant does not address whether there will be any obstacles to adoption and implementation or how it might overcome any such obstacles.

<b>(B)(2) Developing and implementing common, high-quality assessments</b>	<b>10</b>	<b>9</b>	<b>9</b>
--	-----------	----------	----------

### (B)(2) Reviewer Comments: (Tier 1)

Applicant is working toward jointly developing and implementing common, high-quality assessments aligned with the consortium's common set of K-12 standards. Applicant has signed MOU/MOAs with three consortia, each of which represents multiple states, ranging from 13-37 states. New York has signed on to all three because it wants to evaluate and determine which one will ultimately meet the state's goals for having high-quality assessments. State will choose one consortium and plans to participate with that consortium in the Race to the Top Assessment competition. Hedging its bets on the various consortia, New York should be praised on the one hand for being careful; on the other hand, New York is not investing fully in the process of making one set of assessments the best they can be.

<b>(B)(3) Supporting the transition to enhanced standards and high-quality assessments</b>	<b>20</b>	<b>20</b>	<b>20</b>
--	-----------	-----------	-----------

### (B)(3) Reviewer Comments: (Tier 1)

Applicant is clear that it understands that simply adopting enhanced standards and high-quality assessments is not sufficient for successfully translating the new aspects of the educational process into increased student achievement. Applicant has a good plan to train educators on the standards and assessments and to develop and implement formative and interim assessments, even if a given consortium does not plan to do so. Applicant understands that generating stakeholder buy in is an important way to anticipate and overcome potential challenges to successful implementation.

Total	70	67	67
-------	----	----	----



**C. Data Systems to Support Instruction**

	Available	Tier 1	Tier 2	Init
<b>(C)(1) Fully Implementing a statewide longitudinal data system</b>	<b>24</b>	<b>10</b>	<b>10</b>	

**(C)(1) Reviewer Comments: (Tier 1)**

Applicant has fully in place 5 of the 12 components (10 points), but only has partially in place 5 of the 12 components and not in place at all 2 of the 12 components.

<b>(C)(2) Accessing and using State data</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>5</b>	
--	----------	----------	----------	--

**(C)(2) Reviewer Comments: (Tier 1)**

Applicant has a clear action plan for ensuring that stakeholders (including parents, educators, researchers, and advocacy groups) will have access to data, and it is to the state's credit that the development of the data products that will be used involves the stakeholders themselves. Applicant's high-quality plan, which includes an implementation timeline and task forces, is informed by the experiences in other states.

<b>(C)(3) Using data to Improve Instruction</b>	<b>18</b>	<b>13</b>	<b>13</b>	
---	-----------	-----------	-----------	--

**(C)(3) Reviewer Comments: (Tier 1)**

(i) Applicant has a strong plan to increase the acquisition, adoption, and use of local instructional improvement systems that provide teachers, principals, and administrators with the information and resources they need to inform and improve their instructional practices, decision-making, and overall effectiveness. Applicant describes the Statewide Instructional Reporting and Improvement System, which will be focused on improving instructional practice. Applicant reports that this system "will provide robust student, teacher, school, district, and state-level information to teachers, administrators, the public, policymakers, and researchers." This system will be based on the NYC school system's high-quality system, which even allows parents to log-in and have access to individualized reports on their children. Applicant lays out a clear action plan to develop and roll out the system, which will also include early warning systems for at-risk students, across the state. (6/6) (ii) Applicant has a somewhat clear plan to support participating LEAs and schools that will be using the instructional improvement systems. The professional development will be rolled out through teams, in a manner based on a model used in Southern California. This portion of the plan is not as strong. (3/6) (iii) Applicant states that it intends to make the data from the instructional improvement system, together with the statewide longitudinal data system, available to researchers. Applicant indicates that it will "provide an expedited process to provide data to researchers who need de-identified student-level data, depending on the nature and justification of the request." Generally, the applicant does a good job describing its plan to meet the criteria in this area; however, the language of the "justification of the request" is not sufficiently clear to indicate fully the extent to which the applicant meets the goal of transparency. (4/6)

<b>Total</b>	<b>47</b>	<b>28</b>	<b>28</b>	
--------------	-----------	-----------	-----------	--

**D. Great Teachers and Leaders**

	Available	Tier 1	Tier 2	Init
<b>(D)(1) Providing high-quality pathways for aspiring teachers and principals</b>	<b>21</b>	<b>20</b>	<b>20</b>	

**(D)(1) Reviewer Comments: (Tier 1)**

(i) Applicant describes strong legal provisions that allow for alternative routes to certification for teachers and principals. These routes allow for providers other than IHEs. State has alternate route teacher



programs for career changers and for talented recent graduates who have not completed a traditional teacher education program. The policy is strong in that highly-talented alternate route candidates can test out of certain requirements but still must demonstrate mastery of content knowledge. (7/7) (ii) Applicant reports that there are numerous (over 400) alternate routes in use across the state, and over 2000 alternate route candidates were issued teaching certificates in 2008-09. In NYC, which educates approximately one-half of the students covered by LEAs participating in this plan, there are several prominent, competitive alternate route programs in place. These alternate programs, including Teacher U., are bringing tremendous young talent to the city's neediest schools and are filling hard-to-staff subjects, such as math. The alternate routes for principals are lagging behind in producing large numbers of high-quality school leaders (6/7) (iii) Applicant describes a sophisticated process for monitoring, evaluating, and identifying areas of teacher and principal shortage and for preparing teachers and principals to fill these areas of shortage. (7/7)

<b>(D)(2) Improving teacher and principal effectiveness based on performance</b>	<b>58</b>	<b>36</b>	<b>36</b>
(i) Measuring student growth	5	4	4
(ii) Developing evaluation systems	15	11	11
(iii) Conducting annual evaluations	10	9	9
(iv) Using evaluations to inform key decisions	28	12	12

**(D)(2) Reviewer Comments: (Tier 1)**

Applicant describes possible ways that LEAs can work to improve teacher and principal effectiveness based on performance and states that the Board of Regents has authorized NYSED to improve important aspects of the evaluator evaluation process. There is some question about the ability of the LEAs to pull off implementation of plans to improve teacher evaluation given the collective bargaining process in the state and the fact that many union locals did not sign on to this reform plan. (i) Applicant has a reasonable plan to develop a way to measure student achievement growth for all students. The plan is to form a Value-Added Model Advisory Committee that will include representatives from NYSED, LEAs, and Institutions of Higher Education to oversee the selection of an external partner who will help develop a value-added model for use in educator evaluations. (4/5) (ii) Applicant has a somewhat strong plan to redesign its teacher performance review system that has multiple measures. This evaluation system, even when revamped, appears to have perhaps too large a focus on inputs and not a sufficient focus on the outcome of raised student achievement. Applicant also intends to redesign the evaluation system for principals and will have five rating criteria, one of which will be analysis of student achievement and growth data. In spite of potential shortcomings in the ability to implement important teacher accountability reforms, applicant does well by recognizing that collective bargaining realities are a likely obstacle to aggressive reform in teacher evaluation and therefore has a creative incentive plan to drive changes in teacher evaluation processes at the local level. (iii) State currently conducts annual evaluations for teachers and principals, and applicant describes a good plan for improving timelines of feedback and the delivery of information on student achievement growth to educators. Applicant also recognizes the importance of frequent informal evaluations. Applicant's plan for training evaluators and ensuring frequent informal evaluations is not as clear as it might be. (iv) Applicant has a good plan to increase the use of evaluations to drive professional development. Applicant describes positive recent efforts to change the methods of teacher and principal career advancement, which will involve the use of new career ladders to tie advancement to superior performance. There is not, however, an aggressive commitment to roll these changes out across the state at this point. Applicant describes the intent to have LEAs use evaluation information to inform important decisions, such as those regarding compensation and tenure, but it is not evident that there is commitment from all LEAs to do so.

<b>(D)(3) Ensuring equitable distribution of effective teachers and principals</b>	<b>25</b>	<b>17</b>	<b>17</b>
--	-----------	-----------	-----------



(i) Ensuring equitable distribution in high-poverty or high-minority schools	15	12	12
(ii) Ensuring equitable distribution in hard-to-staff subjects and specialty areas	10	5	5

**(D)(3) Reviewer Comments: (Tier 1)**

(i) New York has implemented policies to ensure the equitable distribution of teachers and principals and has a plan, informed by reviews of prior actions and data, to ensure that students in high-poverty and/or high-minority schools have equitable access to highly effective teachers and principals and are not served by ineffective teachers and principals at higher rates than other students. The plan has included the abolition of emergency certification and the use of high-quality alternate routes. New York also plans to strengthen the existing process for monitoring the equitable distribution of high-quality teachers and principals. The plan to evaluate teacher value added across districts is strong. The plan to address potential inequities within districts is not as clear. However, applicant's plan to have an incentive program to motivate LEAs and their collective bargaining units to ensure the equitable distribution of teachers and principals is creative. (ii) New York has made progress over the past few years in increasing the number and percentage of highly qualified teachers working in hard-to-staff subjects and specialty areas, but as for increasing the number and percentage of highly effective teachers, the only particularly strong initiative described involves the use of financial bonuses to incentivize the most effective teachers to remain in schools and classrooms serving high-poverty and high-minority students statewide. This differential pay initiative will offer \$30,000 retention bonuses and can reach 1,000 teachers annually in approximately 300 high-need schools. Applicant also refers to an acceptable sustainability strategy for the bonuses.

**(D)(4) Improving the effectiveness of teacher and principal preparation programs**

14	11	11
----	----	----

**(D)(4) Reviewer Comments: (Tier 1)**

(i) Applicant has a good plan to link student achievement and student growth data to the students' teachers and principals, to link this information to the in-State programs where those teachers and principals were prepared for credentialing, and to publicly report the data for each credentialing program in the State. For the public reporting, applicant plans to develop institutional profiles for each credentialing program in the state. The main drawback is that the timeline for this activity is not particularly aggressive -- i.e. applicant only plans to be able to have publicly available performance data for approximately one-half of preparation programs by the end of SY 2013-14. (5/7)(ii) Applicant intends to expand preparation and credentialing options and programs that are successful at producing effective teachers and principals. The plan for principals will involve issuing an RFP to fund ten programs that partner leadership preparation providers with schools serving high-need students and establish research-based program elements to be demonstrated through performance assessments. There is a similar plan for teacher preparation programs. Applicant also describes a good plan to build proof of effectiveness at raising student achievement into the certification process. (8/7)

**(D)(5) Providing effective support to teachers and principals**

20	16	16
----	----	----

**(D)(5) Reviewer Comments: (Tier 1)**

(i) Applicant has a good plan to provide comprehensive and action-oriented district-wide diagnostics which will assist LEAs in prioritizing reform strategies, differentiating professional development for all teachers and principals based upon student performance and growth, and building LEA capacity for data analysis to inform instructional practice. The state will create Education Diagnostic Teams that will work with districts and that will be modeled on the school inspection processes of best charter authorizers and school quality reviews. Applicant also describes how it will pilot training on the use of formative assessments; however, it is not clear that this particular training will impact enough teachers. The applicant's plan for creating a new teacher induction program is strong, research-based, and intended to reach thousands of teachers to promote retention. (8/10)(ii) Applicant clearly articulates its plan to measure, evaluate, and continuously



improve the effectiveness of the professional development and induction supports described in its application in order to improve student achievement. Applicant states: A statewide evaluation of funded projects will occur annually. Projects will be required to have a local evaluation component documenting frequency of delivery and participation in the professional development, effect on teacher content knowledge, transfer of knowledge and skills to classroom practice, and measures of effect on student growth on achievement and perceptions. NYSED will use the results of these evaluations to determine which projects merit further investment and dissemination across the State. The only drawback is that the applicant does not sufficiently describe how this will occur. (8/10)

Total	138	100	100
-------	-----	-----	-----

### E. Turning Around the Lowest-Achieving Schools

	Available	Tier 1	Tier 2	Init
(E)(1) Intervening in the lowest-achieving schools and LEAs	10	10	10	

#### (E)(1) Reviewer Comments: (Tier 1)

Applicant explains that in New York, the State has relatively extensive legal authority to intervene directly in the State's persistently lowest-achieving schools. Applicant describes the process for state intervention that can lead to closure. New York is also participating in the federal Differentiated Accountability project, aimed to drive fundamental reform (such as significant changes in the staff, governance, or organization) where needed, and may include a plan to close or phase out the school. State may also intervene directly in chronically low-performing LEAs, and applicant gives an example of when this has occurred.

(E)(2) Turning around the lowest-achieving schools	40	22	22	
(i) Identifying the persistently lowest-achieving schools	5	4	4	
(ii) Turning around the persistently lowest-achieving schools	35	18	18	

#### (E)(2) Reviewer Comments: (Tier 1)

(i) State has a reasonable plan, which it will be aligning with RTTT priorities, to identify the persistently lowest-achieving schools. (ii) Applicant describes how it will support its LEAs in turning around failing schools. One highlight is the plan to start The Office of Innovative School Models (OISM), which will open in February of 2010 and focus on supporting the creation of new school models to serve as successors to low-achieving schools that will be phased out, closed, or restarted. Another strong service the state will provide is the ETACIT support system which will provide direct technical assistance to districts with identified low-performing schools, guiding them through every step of the process from conducting a district-level diagnostic assessment that will inform their choice of an intervention model to evaluating potential lead partners and selecting the one that best meets the needs of the LEA and school community. The plan to offer schools the ability to create Partnership Zones, which provide limited increases in school-based control, may help some failing schools. It appears, however, that the state is leaving a lot of, and perhaps too much, discretion to the LEAs for how they will deal with the chronically lowest-performing schools. Despite the legal authority to do so and the technical ability to identify the lowest achieving schools, the state has been slow to intervene dramatically in enough schools. In a state where there are over 4000 schools, it appears that the state has only made efforts to close a small handful of chronically low performing schools over the past 5 years. As such, when considering the state's historic performance in intervening in and turning around the persistently lowest-performing schools, the credibility of the plan moving forward is undermined. Moreover, the targets set for intervention as a part of this new plan are also not particularly aggressive.



Total	50	32	32
-------	----	----	----

**F. General**

	Available	Tier 1	Tier 2	Init
(F)(1) Making education funding a priority	10	5	5	

**(F)(1) Reviewer Comments: (Tier 1)**

(i) The percentage of the total revenues available to the State that were used to support elementary, secondary, and public higher education for FY 2009 was slightly greater than the percentage of the total revenues available to the State that were used to support elementary, secondary, and public higher education for FY 2008. (4/5)(ii) The State's foundation formula is designed to lead to equitable funding across LEAs. Applicant does not provide data to demonstrate that there is in fact equitable funding across and within districts. (1/5)

(F)(2) Ensuring successful conditions for high-performing charter schools and other innovative schools	40	26	24	
--	----	----	----	--

**(F)(2) Reviewer Comments: (Tier 1)**

(i) Applicant states that state law has a cap of 200 on start-up charter schools but attempts to argue that this does not prohibit or effectively limit the number of high-performing charter schools in the state because technically there is no cap on conversion charter schools. This reasoning is not convincing. There are currently 140 charter schools and 4540 traditional public schools, which is not a large percentage. (4/8)(ii) The applicant reports having a rigorous approval, monitoring, and reauthorization process. Applicant reports that 8 charter schools have been closed for poor academics. As a percentage of the total number in operation now this is a relatively large percentage, when compared to the percentage of closures in the traditional sector over the same 5 year period. The ratio (81/153) of schools approved suggests that the approval process is relatively difficult. (8/8) (iii) Applicant reports that the state's procedure for funding charter schools results in their receiving equitable funding compared to traditional public schools. State provides additional funding in addition to per pupil tuition allowances. Unfortunately, applicant fails to provide evidence to prove this point through a per pupil ratio of charter to traditional public school funding per pupil. (5/8) (iv) Despite the fact that there is not funding dedicated solely to facilities costs, applicant reports that there are several funding streams to help support charter schools with their facilities funding needs. In addition, applicant notes that there are some ways in which the restrictions on charters regarding facilities may actually be less stringent than those on traditional public schools. (5/8) (v) Technically, the state generally enables LEAs to operate innovative, autonomous public schools other than charter schools; applicant states: The board of education of each school district has authority to prescribe the course of study, employ teachers and other staff, exercise budgetary control and otherwise exercise the superintendence, management and control of the school district. It does not appear that state meets these criteria to the full extent. (4/8)

**(F)(2) Reviewer Comments: (Tier 2)**

The cap on the charter law does have the effect to be severely inhibiting on new charter schools.

(F)(3) Demonstrating other significant reform conditions	5	3	3	
--	---	---	---	--

**(F)(3) Reviewer Comments: (Tier 1)**

Applicant has not demonstrated to a large extent that, in addition to information provided under other State Reform Conditions Criteria, it has created, through law, regulation, or policy, other conditions favorable to education reform or innovation that have increased student achievement or graduation rates, narrowed achievement gaps, or resulted in other important outcomes. Although having access to resource materials through museums and libraries is valuable, it is not clear the extent to which this access has led to increases in graduation rates and student achievement. The applicant does, however, describe a strong



program of cooperation between LEAs and IHEs. Applicant describes how tens of thousands of students have taken advantage of various drop-out prevention services, for example.

Total	55	34	32
-------	----	----	----

### Competitive Preference Priority 2: Emphasis on STEM

	Available	Tier 1	Tier 2	Init
Competitive Preference Priority 2: Emphasis on STEM	15	0	0	

#### Competitive Reviewer Comments: (Tier 1)

Applicant does have a plan to address many of the priorities listed in the criteria for this competitive preference category. However, the plan does not address all aspects. In particular, applicant has not provided sufficient evidence that its plan will result in the preparation of more students for advanced study and careers in the sciences, technology, engineering, and mathematics, including by addressing the needs of underrepresented groups and of women and girls in the areas of science, technology, engineering, and mathematics.

Total	15	0	0	
-------	----	---	---	--

### Absolute Priority - Comprehensive Approach to Education Reform

	Available	Tier 1	Tier 2	Init
Absolute Priority - Comprehensive Approach to Education Reform		Yes	Yes	

#### Absolute Reviewer Comments: (Tier 1)

To a sufficient extent to meet this absolute priority, the State's application comprehensively and coherently addresses all of the four education reform areas specified in the ARRA as well as the State Success Factors Criteria in order to demonstrate that the state and its participating LEAs are taking a systemic approach to education reform. In addition, the state has demonstrated in its application sufficient LEA participation and commitment to successfully implement and achieve the goals in its plans. The applicant sufficiently describes how the state, in collaboration with its participating LEAs, will use Race to the Top and other funds to increase student achievement, decrease the achievement gaps across student subgroups, and increase the rates at which students graduate from high school prepared for college and careers. Not all of the components of the plan are equally strong, however. The application itself is relatively well written. The action steps and timelines are clear for most initiatives, and the personnel charged with implementation appear relatively well qualified. The state's plan for intervening in persistently low-performing schools and for expanding the role of charter schools is not as aggressive as it might be, however.

Total		0	0	
-------	--	---	---	--

Grand Total	500	356	350	
-------------	-----	-----	-----	--





# Race to the Top

## Technical Review Form - Tier 2

### New York Application #4800



#### A. State Success Factors

	Available	Tier 1	Tier 2	Init
<b>(A)(1) Articulating State's education reform agenda and LEA's participation in it</b>	<b>65</b>	<b>61</b>	<b>57</b>	
(i) Articulating comprehensive, coherent reform agenda	5	5	5	
(ii) Securing LEA commitment	45	44	40	
(iii) Translating LEA participation into statewide impact	15	12	12	

#### (A)(1) Reviewer Comments: (Tier 1)

The State uses its 2005 publication, P-16: A Plan for Action, as a framework for its RtT plan; accordingly, the plan reflects a comprehensive and coherent reform agenda that clearly articulates goals aligned with ARRA. The State's MOU is essentially the same as the Department of Education's MOU, ensuring participating LEAs are committed to the State's plans. The State's scope-of-work descriptions require participating LEAs to implement all or significant portions of the plan; in fact, the State did not include LEAs that sought to "insert qualifying language that materially changed the meaning of the MOU." Participating LEAs (66% of all LEAs) serve 94% of all poor students and 82% of all students. As a result, the student make-up among participating LEAs aligns with the students targeted in the State's aggressive but attainable plan. The State's plan has strong leadership support among participating LEAs; it has acquired signatures from every LEA Superintendent, over 90% of Local School Boards, and 60% of Local Teachers' Union. This ensures successful implementation of the State's plan translates into broad statewide impact. The State has set accelerated performance targets for increasing student achievement in reading/language arts and mathematics on NAEP and decreasing achievement gaps between subgroups on NAEP. The State's high school graduation goal of 76%, a percentage increase of 4.5%, seems low given the State's narrative and student achievement performance goals. Also, the State measures college enrollment as students who are enrolled in college 16 months after graduation rather than the fall immediately following graduation. Holding schools accountable for the enrollment performance of their graduates over a year and a half after graduation seems unreasonable as a high school performance measure.

#### (A)(1) Reviewer Comments: (Tier 2)

The State confirms its MOU has been modified so that "nothing in [its] MOU shall be construed to override any applicable state or local collective bargaining." This modification may reflect an attempt by the State to engage its state and local teachers union, of which only 60% of its local teachers union have signed on. The challenge; however, is the language gives schools vis-a-vis their teachers and principals an out when implementing elements of its RtT reform efforts.

<b>(A)(2) Building strong statewide capacity to implement, scale up, and sustain proposed plans</b>	<b>30</b>	<b>18</b>	<b>25</b>	
(i) Ensuring the capacity to implement	20	16	16	
(ii) Using broad stakeholder support	10	2	9	

#### (A)(2) Reviewer Comments: (Tier 1)



The State provides leadership and dedicated teams to implement its statewide education reform plan; however, the plan's principals are relatively new NYSED hires. In addition to RttT implementation, these new hires will lead the Department of Education's redesign efforts. It is unclear if the new team will have the resources, bandwidth, and political capital to successfully implement RttT, while undertaking the herculean effort of revamping the agency. While this unknown is significant and may affect the State's capacity to implement, the decision to simultaneously tackle these efforts gives the State the cover it may need to significantly transform NYSED from compliance to a service-oriented agency. The State does have a solid track record supporting LEAs and implementing large scale programs, such as the currently suspended C4E and comprehensive revision of its ELA standards. The State illustrates a clear path for supporting participating LEAs with successful implementation. The State's discussion of its ability to manage an RttT grant does not specifically address the State's capacity to manage the grant and strategy for aligning local resources with RttT dollars. In addition, the State's budget seems bloated. The State includes budget items of \$550 for Executive Chairs and \$3,000 for a bookcase. These inclusions compromise the State's narrative as a careful steward of public funds. The narrative seems to be boiler-plate language rather than a well-constructed response. The State establishes stakeholder support by listing the meetings it held with a broad diverse group and referencing the receipt of 98 support letters. These letters, however, are not included in the appendix, which makes assessing support for the plan difficult. In addition, the State does not include meetings held with labor and the business community.

**(A)(2) Reviewer Comments: (Tier 2)**

Due to a technical error by the Department, the State's letters of support were not included in the State's proposal. This problem has been rectified and, after reviewing the letters of support, the state sufficiently establishes broad stakeholder support.

<b>(A)(3) Demonstrating significant progress in raising achievement and closing gaps</b>	<b>30</b>	<b>24</b>	<b>24</b>	
(i) Making progress in each reform area	5	5	5	
(ii) Improving student outcomes	25	19	19	

**(A)(3) Reviewer Comments: (Tier 1)**

The State provides sufficient and succinct descriptions of its progress to date on ARRA goals. While the State's description of its progress in each reform area is compelling, the data is mixed. 4th graders have historically performed above the national average in math and reading, yet reading scores have remained stagnant over the years. Year to year results in 8th grade reading has not increased or decreased significantly. In terms of subgroups, the State is nationally recognized for narrowing achievement gaps between white students and students of color. While cohort graduation rates have increased, the number of poor students graduating from high school has not seen a significant increase over the years. In addition, the State does not explain what actions led to its results.

<b>Total</b>	<b>125</b>	<b>103</b>	<b>106</b>	
--------------	------------	------------	------------	--

**B. Standards and Assessments**

	<b>Available</b>	<b>Tier 1</b>	<b>Tier 2</b>	<b>Init</b>
<b>(B)(1) Developing and adopting common standards</b>	<b>40</b>	<b>36</b>	<b>36</b>	
(i) Participating in consortium developing high-quality standards	20	20	20	
(ii) Adopting standards	20	16	16	

**(B)(1) Reviewer Comments: (Tier 1)**



New York, like 47 other states, is a Common Core Standards Initiative partner. This is evidence the State is working toward jointly developing and adopting a common set of K-12 standards that are supported by evidence that they are internationally benchmarked and build toward college and career readiness by the time of high school graduation. The State has a well-thought out plan, backed with a rationale for its assumptions, for adopting said standards in 2010. The State does not describe how it will "implement the standards thereafter in a well-planned way".

**(B)(2) Developing and implementing common, high-quality assessments**

10

9

9

**(B)(2) Reviewer Comments: (Tier 1)**

The State has signed MOUs with several consortia, including BAC, SMARTER, and Florida's Assessment Consortium. These groups collectively affirm the State's efforts working toward jointly developing and implementing common, high-quality assessments aligned with the consortium's common set of K-12 standards. Because the State participates in several consortia, the consortium with the highest participation rate was used to determine whether or not the State is participating in a consortium with a significant number of states. 36 states participate in BAM.

**(B)(3) Supporting the transition to enhanced standards and high-quality assessments**

20

14

14

**(B)(3) Reviewer Comments: (Tier 1)**

The State establishes a clear rollout plan for getting every LEA to adopt CSS's ELA and Math standards. The State plans to develop a comprehensive assessment system in tandem with adopting enhanced standards. The adoption of enhanced standards may be feasible, yet the plan lacks specific implementation details.

**Total**

70

59

59

**C. Data Systems to Support Instruction**

**(C)(1) Fully implementing a statewide longitudinal data system**

Available

Tier 1

Tier 2

Init

24

10

10

**(C)(1) Reviewer Comments: (Tier 1)**

The State has fully implemented five elements of the America COMPETES Act.

**(C)(2) Accessing and using State data**

5

5

5

**(C)(2) Reviewer Comments: (Tier 1)**

The State has an ambitious P-20 data vision, and its articulation and explanation of its seven goals reflect a high-quality plan for ensuring data from the State's statewide longitudinal data system are accessible to, and used to inform and engage key stakeholders. The State's description of regulatory changes specific to data systems and requirements for participating districts ensure data drives instructional reporting and is used to inform decision-making and practice.

**(C)(3) Using data to improve instruction**

18

17

17

**(C)(3) Reviewer Comments: (Tier 1)**

The State excels at highlighting the systems already in place for improving instruction through data, such as its Statewide Instructional Reporting and Improvement System, Achievement Reporting and Innovation System, and Collaborative Inquiry Network, and articulating a plan that maximizes the use and utility of said



reporting systems. The State's explanation of its 3 key activities - creating a comprehensive instructional reporting and improvement system, providing integrated professional development through a statewide network, and making the data from the instructional improvement system and the longitudinal data system fully accessible electronically to researchers - represents a high-quality plan to make data available and accessible to all and used in a meaningful way by teachers, principals, and administrators. The State's strategy of finding out what works through reports and pilots then scaling up promising practices is smart. Further, the State's prioritization of turnaround school districts and low-performing schools ensures dollars and supports will go to schools in the worst condition.

Total	47	32	32
-------	----	----	----

#### D. Great Teachers and Leaders

	Available	Tier 1	Tier 2	Init
(D)(1) Providing high-quality pathways for aspiring teachers and principals	21	18	18	

##### (D)(1) Reviewer Comments: (Tier 1)

The State has the legal authority to allow alternative routes to certification for teachers and principals. The State clearly describes its three routes to alternative teacher certification, yet principal alternative certification routes are murky. The State provides data on "school building leaders" certified under "all existing routes to certification." The State does not disaggregate the data, so it is impossible to know how many principals have completed each program. The State has the authority to offer alternative routes to certification for teachers and principals independent of IHEs, yet this authority is limited to "clinically-rich preparation programs." The State plans to pilot a graduate-level clinical residency programs that meets this criterion in the near term. The State has established a process for monitoring, evaluating, and identifying areas of teacher and principal shortage and for preparing teachers and principals to fill these areas of shortage. The State's teacher and principal supply-demand model is a data-driven approach to identifying shortages that has played a meaningful role in informing staffing and programmatic decisions. For example, the reports were used in revising the State's certificate structure for teachers of students with disabilities and informing the State's strategy for expanding programs in shortage areas.

(D)(2) Improving teacher and principal effectiveness based on performance	58	38	38	
(i) Measuring student growth	5	4	4	
(ii) Developing evaluation systems	15	10	10	
(iii) Conducting annual evaluations	10	8	8	
(iv) Using evaluations to inform key decisions	28	16	16	

##### (D)(2) Reviewer Comments: (Tier 1)

The State highlights two activities towards establishing clear approaches to measuring student growth: developing a committee to select a partner and coordinating a value-added growth model pilot. The State, however, does not explain how the pilot efforts are a clear approach to measuring student growth or how they contribute to the process of measuring student growth. Further, the State's description for using its multiple rating categories in the evaluation process is undercut by the State's strong and somewhat out of place statement that the rating system "must be consistent with any applicable collective bargaining requirements." The use of such strong phrasing sends the message that the State's plan may not follow collective bargaining requirements, and it wants to reassure key stakeholders that its plan will follow collective bargaining requirements. A key element to a high-quality plan is how it is "designed and developed with teacher and principal involvement," yet the State's plan does not describe how these groups



will be meaningfully engaged in the process. The State's stated goal to "successfully execute annual evaluations," may reflect a poor track record by the State to review every teacher and school leader every year. Interestingly, the State does not hold LEAs accountable in a meaningful way to evaluating every teacher every year. The State, regardless of how often teachers will be assessed, articulates an evaluation process that provides constructive feedback and student-level student growth data. The State's narrative for compensating, promoting, and retaining teachers and principals does not address how data will be used to inform human capital decisions. Further, the plan does not explain data's role in granting tenure or removing ineffective teachers; in fact, the State not include performance measures on the aforementioned areas.

<b>(D)(3) Ensuring equitable distribution of effective teachers and principals</b>	<b>25</b>	<b>19</b>	<b>19</b>
(i) Ensuring equitable distribution in high-poverty or high-minority schools	15	10	10
(ii) Ensuring equitable distribution in hard-to-staff subjects and specialty areas	10	9	9

**(D)(3) Reviewer Comments: (Tier 1)**

The State outlines a quality plan for ensuring the equitable distribution of teachers and principals in high-poverty or high-minority schools. The State's "Educator Value-Add Equity Indices" will help resolve intra-district inequity challenges. The plan does have a few challenges. The State allows participating LEAs to opt out of using the effectiveness ratings to determine equitable distribution of teachers and leaders. This increases the risk that high poverty/high minority schools will not receive their fair share of highly effective teachers. The State's plan for equitable distribution of teachers and principals does not draw a clear distinction between highly qualified and highly effective teachers. The State's effort to redesign teacher preparation programs is strategic and important, since it will allow the State to focus the largest producers of teachers in shortage areas on outcomes based approaches. The State's plan to provide financial rewards as a motivator for great teachers to teach in greatly needed areas is promising and should produce lessons for the state and similarly situated districts.

<b>(D)(4) Improving the effectiveness of teacher and principal preparation programs</b>	<b>14</b>	<b>12</b>	<b>12</b>
---	-----------	-----------	-----------

**(D)(4) Reviewer Comments: (Tier 1)**

The State has a high-quality plan to link student achievement and student growth data to the students' teachers and principals, to link this information to the In-State programs where those teachers and principals were prepared for credentialing, and to publicly report the data for each credentialing program in the State. Given the significant investment the State plans to make in its P-20 Longitudinal Data System, its performance measures on credentialing programs and student achievement are too low. As a result, the plan does not seize the opportunity to fully maximize the State's investment in making data meaningful and actionable. The State outlines initiatives to grow what works – investing in and expanding preparation and credentialing options that are producing results. The State's plan to build into their initial certification process for new teacher's performance based assessments with growth measures ensures future teachers are prepared and evaluated on their ability to increase student achievement. Also, the State plans to develop a teacher and principal preparation program performance accountability system; however, the measures are not used to hold programs accountable but to "inform the public."

<b>(D)(5) Providing effective support to teachers and principals</b>	<b>20</b>	<b>14</b>	<b>14</b>
--	-----------	-----------	-----------

**(D)(5) Reviewer Comments: (Tier 1)**

The State's implementation of its high quality plan will give LEAs access to rich actionable data that can drive professional development, coaching, and induction. The State's plan to measure, evaluate, and continuously improve the effectiveness of those supports in order to improve student achievement is solid,



yet its plan to use a compliance type report to determine which projects are producing results and merit more money overextends the role and value of such reports. Also, the plan describes a program's evaluation components; it does not describe "how" the programs will be evaluated. For example, the plan does not detail how the "transfer the knowledge and skills to classroom practice" will be evaluated.

Total	138	101	101
-------	-----	-----	-----

### E. Turning Around the Lowest-Achieving Schools

	Available	Tier 1	Tier 2	Init
(E)(1) Intervening in the lowest-achieving schools and LEAs	10	10	10	

#### (E)(1) Reviewer Comments: (Tier 1)

The State has the legal authority to intervene direction in the State's persistently lowest-achieving schools and LEAs in improvement or corrective action.

(E)(2) Turning around the lowest-achieving schools	40	36	39	
(i) Identifying the persistently lowest-achieving schools	5	2	5	
(ii) Turning around the persistently lowest-achieving schools	35	34	34	

#### (E)(2) Reviewer Comments: (Tier 1)

The State has a system in place for identifying its lowest-performing school; however, the State's formula only identifies 57 schools or a little more than 1% of all schools. The dearth of schools identified comprises the validity of the State's formula. The State has a high-quality plan to support its LEAs in turning around these schools by implementing one of the four school intervention models proposed by the Department of Education. The State's strategy, providing additional supports to poor performing districts and schools through a support zone, may have the positive consequence of ensuring best practices are shared and educators have a community of supports. The State's reliance on RFPs as a strategy does not in and of itself constitute a plan; however, the process of identifying and using intermediary partners should allow failing entities to identify supports that align with needs of their schools, and, in the process, to immediately begin working to deliver the right intervention model. The State's virtual schools initiative has the potential to develop into an innovative, scalable, and field-tested model for delivering education.

#### (E)(2) Reviewer Comments: (Tier 2)

The State's formula for identifying its lowest-achieving schools is consistent with the Department of Education's formula for identifying low-achieving schools. Upon further review, the State's has sufficiently identified its persistently lowest-performing schools.

Total	50	46	49
-------	----	----	----

### F. General

	Available	Tier 1	Tier 2	Init
(F)(1) Making education funding a priority	10	6	6	

#### (F)(1) Reviewer Comments: (Tier 1)

The State's percentage of the total revenues used to support elementary, secondary, and public higher education in FY 2009 was slightly less than the total revenues available to the State FY 2008. The State's



Foundation Aid formula and C4E initiative policies are key actions that may lead to equitable funding (a) between high-need LEAs and other LEAs, and (b) within LEAs, between high-poverty schools and other schools in the State. The challenge, however, is education funding has decreased and the phase-in of the Foundation Aid formula has been delayed due of the economic crisis. These two actions undercut the State's narrative on education being a priority.

<b>(F)(2) Ensuring successful conditions for high-performing charter schools and other innovative schools</b>	40	34	34
---	----	----	----

**(F)(2) Reviewer Comments: (Tier 1)**

The State has a charter school law that effectively inhibits increasing the number of high-performing charter schools in the State. The current charter cap is 200, and there are 134 non-conversion charter schools currently operating. Given the size of the state and annually descending charter slots, the charter school limit is inhibiting. The State's plan reasonably explains how schools and LEAs receive equitable funding and facilities funding. The State has been nationally recognized for its charter quality control policies, including "its provision for performance-based charter contracts; comprehensive charter school monitoring and data collection processes; and clear processes for renewal, no-renewal, and revocation decisions." The State's law allowing LEAs to operate public schools other than charter schools is limited to LEAs where unions are not present.

<b>(F)(3) Demonstrating other significant reform conditions</b>	5	5	5
---	---	---	---

**(F)(3) Reviewer Comments: (Tier 1)**

The State demonstrates other significant reform conditions that are favorable to education reform.

<b>Total</b>	55	45	45
--------------	----	----	----

### Competitive Preference Priority 2: Emphasis on STEM

	Available	Tier 1	Tier 2	Init
<b>Competitive Preference Priority 2: Emphasis on STEM</b>	15	0	0	

**Competitive Reviewer Comments: (Tier 1)**

The State successfully integrates STEM strategies throughout its proposal. The State's application addresses the need to (i) offer a rigorous course of study in mathematics, the sciences, technology, and engineering by 1) implementing the new Common Core math standards, 2) establishing new standards and assessments in technology, 3) providing aligned curriculum frameworks for STEM; (ii) cooperate with STEM-capable community partners to prepare and assist teachers in integrating STEM content by 1) providing financial incentives for STEM teachers in high schools. The State does not articulate how its plan will (iii) prepare more students for advanced study and careers in the sciences, technology, engineering, and mathematics, including by addressing the needs of underrepresented groups and of women and girls in the areas of science, technology, engineering, and mathematics.

<b>Total</b>	15	0	0
--------------	----	---	---

### Absolute Priority - Comprehensive Approach to Education Reform

	Available	Tier 1	Tier 2	Init
<b>Absolute Priority - Comprehensive Approach to Education Reform</b>		Yes	Yes	



**Absolute Reviewer Comments: (Tier 1)**

The State's application comprehensively and coherently address all of the four education reform areas specified in the ARRA as well as the State Success Factors Criteria and its participating LEAs are taking a systemic approach to education reform.

Total		0	0
Grand Total	500	386	392